THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

VOLUME II CONTENTS FOR AUGUST, 1938 NUMBER 3

THE COOPERATIVE STUDY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STANDARDS..... 307
Walter Crosby Eells, Coordinator, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards

PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITING SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES..... 315
George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education

ARTICULATION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL AND THE COLLEGE..... 325
Thomas H. Briggs, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS AS AN ALL-INSTITUTION RESPONSIBILITY AS PLANNED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA..... 335
Harl R. Douglass, Kenan Professor of Secondary Education and Chairman of Division of Teacher Education, University of North Carolina

THE INDIVIDUAL GOES TO COLLEGE..... 343
H. E. Hawkes, Dean, Columbia University

SOME PROBLEMS OF CATHOLIC SECONDARY EDUCATION..... 351
P. A. Roy, S.J., Dean, Loyola University

I AM A DEBTOR..... 358
Spencer McCallie, Headmaster, The McCallie School, Chattanooga, Tennessee

THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF SECONDARY EDUCATION..... 364
Doak S. Campbell, Director of Division of Surveys, Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee

INSTRUCTION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL..... 368
Mildred English, Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Georgia.

THE AMERICAN SECONDARY SCHOOL AND THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE 378
Richard Gummere, Director of Admissions, Harvard University

THE FUNCTIONS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION..... 389
Thomas H. Briggs, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Volume II AUGUST, 1938 Number 3

BOARD OF PUBLICATION

H. L. DONOVAN, President of the Southern Association
President, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College

SHELTON PHELPS, Secretary of the Southern Association
President, Winthrop College

ALEXANDER GUERRY, Secretary of Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
President, University of Chattanooga

FRANK C. JENKINS, Secretary of Commission on Secondary Schools
Director, Southern Association Study in Secondary Schools and Colleges

L. FRAZER BANKS, Secretary of Commission on Curriculum and Research
Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Birmingham

EDITOR

HOLLAND HOLTON, *Professor of Education, Duke University*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

President Donovan, President Phelps, Professor Holton

Reference to the minutes of the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in Richmond, Virginia, December 3, 4, 1936, as recorded on page 24 of Volume I, Number 1 shows the following official action authorizing this publication.

> Upon recommendation of the Executive Committee the Association voted to adopt the report of the Committee on Publications appointed at the fortieth annual meeting.
>
> The Committee on Publications of the Southern Association unanimously submits the following recommendations:
>
> 1. That a Southern Association Quarterly be issued.
>
> 2. That a board of five members be held responsible for securing an editor and supervising all matters pertaining to the publication and distribution of the Quarterly. This board is to be composed of the secretaries of the three commissions, the president. and the secretary-treasurer of the Association.
>
> 3, 4. (These sections recommended as to the character of the four issues and made appropriation for publication. See page cited above.)

In accordance with these resolutions the Board of Publication as listed above was set up, the editor elected, and the editorial committee constituted to consist of the President and the Secretary of the Association acting with the editor.

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Volume II AUGUST, 1938 Number 3

The Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards*

By Walter Crosby Eells

Coördinator, Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards

The Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards has developed an extensive body of criteria for evaluation of secondary schools which was tried out last year in 200 carefully chosen secondary schoools of all types and sizes in the forty-eight states. These include some 1,100 check list items and 400 evaluations covering the following fields: philosophy and objectives, pupil population, curriculum and courses of study, pupil activity program, library service, guidance service, instruction, outcomes, staff, plant, and administration.

The validity of these measures has been checked by comparison with a composite evaluation which includes not only the above features, but also judgments of committees of educators who visited the schools, results of an extensive testing program involving 17,000 pupils, records of graduates of the schools who entered colleges and universities, records of graduates and former students who did not enter college, judgments of pupils of the schools studied, and judgments of the parents of seniors in these same schools.

Results of this extensive and intensive evaluation are being sent the middle of April to the schools concerned in the form of a series of 150 thermometers so designed as to show the "educational temperature" of the school in each of the important aspects of the school's work. These thermometers are so planned as to permit comparison of a school's standing in each feature with other schools throughout the country, also with those in the same geographical region, of the same size, of the same type, and so forth.

At the meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools earlier this week I reported in considerable detail on the methods and tentative results of the five-year study undertaken by the Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards. In particular I presented, by means of a series of lantern slides, a resumé of the method we have devised to evaluate a secondary school by means of securing its "educational temperature" and of exhibiting these evaluations in such a way as to give a reviewing committee a quickly and

* An address delivered before the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 31, 1938.

easily grasped view of the school as a whole—both its strong and its weak features. I also showed how this method is, we believe, more valid as a true measure of the quality of a school, more flexible in its adaptation to varying educational conditions, and more stimulating to constant efforts at growth and improvement on the part of a school than those in use at the present time.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to remind you that the Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards, formally organized in the summer of 1933, is an outgrowth of informal discussions and conferences running back at least to 1928. It is a temporary, voluntary, coöperative organization of the six regional associations of colleges and secondary schools—the New England, Middle States, North Central, Southern, Northwest, and Western associations. It operates through a Committee of Twenty-One representing these six associations, with a full-time executive, research, and clerical staff at the executive headquarters in Washington, which were opened in September, 1935.

Full details of the history and organization of the Coöperative Study have been given elsewhere, both in public addresses and in printed form, and need not be repeated on this occasion.[1] The stimulus for the organization of the Coöperative Study was increasing dissatisfaction with the existing standards for accrediting secondary schools. This dissatisfaction had developed as a result of the use of these standards in various forms for many years by the principal regional and state accrediting organizations.

This brief paper will be devoted to a presentation and discussion of the underlying bases for the accreditation of secondary schools. I propose to present the subject from two standpoints:

a. Faults with present methods of accreditation;

b. Guiding principles for the development of a new, and we trust improved, method of accreditation.

Faults With Present Methods of Accreditation

All who have had experience with accrediting organizations realize that they have been exceedingly valuable and that they have stimulated to a marked degree the improvement of secondary education in the United States during the past third of a century. Increasing experience with the standards as established and administered by accrediting associations, however, has led to increasing dissatisfaction with them, to a recognition of some of their inherent weaknesses, and to a growing conviction that extensive revision, probably complete reorganization, is necessary. May I suggest some of the outstanding limitations of accreditation procedures as these limitations

[1] Walter C. Eells, "The Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards," *The Educational Record*, XVII (April, 1936), 273-89; and E. D. Grizzell, "The Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards," *North Central Association Quarterly*, XII (July, 1937), 34-44.

are understood by the Coöperative Study? If time permitted, it would not be difficult to give examples of each of these shortcomings, or to support them by formal argument. Because I am much more interested, however, in constructive presentation than in negative criticism, I merely state them without comment. I believe that the common experience of educational leaders here and elsewhere will tend to substantiate their axiomatic character, for the weaknesses of the existing procedures are fairly well appreciated by educators. Common faults found with present methods of accreditation are these:

a. The existing standards have tended to become mechanical rather than vital—to emphasize the shadow rather than the substance—to measure material facilities rather than the educational process—to stress the letter and overlook the spirit of education.

b. The existing standards have tended to become rigid, lacking the desirable flexibility to make them adaptable to different types and sizes of schools with varied problems and objectives.

c. The existing standards have tended to become deadening rather than stimulating—to encourage uniformity rather than diversity—to emphasize conformity rather than initiative—to retard rather than to promote desirable progress through pioneering and adventurous experimentation.

d. The existing standards have failed to take into account some of the more modern viewpoints in education, particularly as concerns the marked individual differences which are known to exist among pupils and the desirability of developing educational programs to meet their particular needs.

e. The existing standards have been narrowly academic rather than broadly comprehensive. They have been developed and applied too much in terms of college entrance specifications without sufficient attention to the needs of the many pupils who probably never will enter institutions of higher education.

f. The existing standards and the methods by which they have been applied have been based, to a considerable extent, on untested assumptions and on personal opinions without sufficient validation by scientific procedures.

May I make it perfectly clear that we recognize that the standards as they have been developed during the past thirty-five years have been of inestimable value in raising the level of secondary education throughout the country. Eternal progress, however, is the price of educational salvation. Those responsible for the inception and organization of the Coöperative Study had become convinced that the time had arrived for a fresh and thoroughgoing attack on the whole problem of accreditation. They felt that mere revision of existing standards was not sufficient. They were firm in the belief that a fundamental study should be made *de novo* which, while

utilizing the results of existing methods of accreditation and experience with them, should not necessarily be bound in any way by them.

What, then, are the fundamental principles, the essential bases, for such an independent attack on the problem? I shall list eighteen which have been submitted to the general committee in charge of the Coöperative Study and approved by its members. These principles are offered for your careful and critical consideration at this stage of the Study. Are they clear? Are they specific? Are they satisfactory? Are we working along right lines in our effort to develop methods of accreditation of secondary schools in harmony with these bases? The Coöperative Study will be glad to have suggestions for desirable changes in substance or in form of expression.

Guiding Principles for Development of Improved Methods of Accreditation

1. American secondary schools, much as they may differ in details, are essentially alike in their underlying purposes and organization.

The common purpose of all secondary schools is the transmission of racial culture and the development of the pupil, individually and as a member of society. They are alike in making use of individual teachers, in functioning in a school plant, in possessing a curriculum, in employing instructional methods, in presupposing a background of knowledge and skill secured in elementary school, in meeting several days a week for a major portion of a calendar year, and in many other respects. If such broad similarities as these did not exist, any common method of evaluation and accreditation would scarcely be feasible.

2. In a democracy the fundamental doctrine of individual differences is as valid for schools as for individuals. Schools, even good schools, differ from each other as markedly as do the children they are endeavoring to educate.

This means that there should be no inflexible insistence upon uniformity and rigidity of organization, method, and standards for all secondary schools in all parts of the country through any artificially imposed accreditation procedures.

3. A school cannot be studied satisfactorily, nor judged fairly, except in terms of its own philosophy of education, its individually expressed purposes and objectives, the nature of the pupils with which it has to deal, and the needs of the community which it serves. Each school is free to determine its own educational policy, if not inconsistent with the democracy in which it functions.

This means that the public school and the private school, the Catholic school and the Protestant school, the urban school and the rural school, the large school and the small school must be judged by comprehensive flexible standards, rather than by narrow, uniform, and rigid ones.

4. Methods of evaluation and accreditation should recognize the differences in background, development, and existing conditions in different states and regions. No attempt now, if ever, should be encouraged to make them uniform for the nation or to have them administered from a single national office.

This means that the same norms cannot fairly be used for judging the plant, the curriculum, the library, and other features in Maine and Montana, in California and Connecticut, in Vermont and Virginia, in New York and New Mexico. It is desirable that studies be made and procedures summarized on a nation-wide basis, but that application of them be made on a regional or state, or even local, basis, with due regard to variations in local conditions and educational, economic, and social background.

5. It is more significant to measure what the school does than what it is or what it has. The educational process and product are more important to evaluate than the machinery and equipment.

This means that all phases of the school—plant, staff, program—are to be evaluated chiefly as functioning units, not primarily as static ones; that the program, the methods of administering it, and its results, are the chief matters to be considered.

6. A school must be judged as a whole, not merely as the unrelated sum of its separate parts.

This means that accreditation will not necessarily be refused because a school is weak in one feature, or fails to meet a particular standard. Possible deficiency in one field may be excusable or even desirable, or may be more than compensated for by superiority in another field or fields. The general level of the school's work and the interrelationships of the different phases of it will need to be considered.

7. Methods of accreditation, as far as possible, should be based upon scientific studies and objective evidence, rather than upon untested assumptions and unsupported opinions.

This means that the results of research studies and other recent scientific investigations of secondary education should be given full consideration in the development of better methods. Standard tests, approved measuring instruments, valid scales, and similar devices should be used—but they should be used intelligently, not blindly.

8. The considered judgment of competent educators is an essential factor in the evaluation of the quality and character of the work of a school.

This principle is not in conflict with the preceding one, but is supplementary to it. It means that while statistical data are necessary, they are not sufficient. There should be a judicious mixture of the subjective and of the objective. Statistical method cannot replace expert judgment, but it can form a much better bases for the legitimate and helpful exercise of

judgment. Judgment should be based upon all the scientific evidence and other objective data available, not on guesswork or hunches. Evaluation should be based upon a careful study by a committee of competent educators, who will spend sufficient time in the school to familiarize themselves with all important phases of its work.

9. A valid method of accreditation and evaluation, based tentatively upon existing research studies and expert judgment, should be fully tested and carefully evaluated by extensive experimental tryout in a large group of typical, representative secondary schools throughout the country.

This is simply a recognition of the common scientific procedure that theory should be tested by experiment, and is an application of it in the educational field. In the case of the Coöperative Study, 200 carefully selected schools have been used as the basis for the validation of the materials and procedures which it expects to recommend.

10. While it is desirable in many respects that absolute standards or levels of achievement should be developed, it is recognized that in most of the important aspects of a school's work the best basis for the development of useful standards will probably be the practice in other comparable schools.

While we may know the definite character and amount of apparatus necessary for an experiment in physics or chemistry for a class of a given size, we do not know the optimum number of books for a library, the most desirable outcomes in the teaching of English, or the best methods of supervision. In such cases, after as valid measurements or evaluations as possible have been made, the adequacy of the school in these fields must be judged in part by comparison with other schools measured by the same methods.

11. A school should be judged in terms of the extent to which it meets satisfactorily the needs of all pupils who come to it, not alone of those who continue their formal education in institutions of higher learning.

Standards have been dominated in many cases, if not completely determined, by college admission criteria. This principle means that it is not sufficient to evaluate the school merely in terms of the success of its graduates in the college and university, important as this may be as one element; it must be evaluated also in terms of its success in giving an education for successful living—economic, social, and personal—to the young people who do not go to college.

12. A good school is a growing school. It should be judged by its progress between two different dates as well as by its status at a single date.

This means, as Oliver Wendell Holmes once observed, that "it is not nearly so important where we stand as the direction in which we are going." A poor school which is steadily improving may be more worthy of accreditation than a much better school which is steadily deteriorating.

13. Any useful, stimulating, and valid method of accreditation must be flexible with the passage of time; that is, it must be capable of reasonable modification from year to year as new bases of evaluation and different levels of achievement are suggested or developed from the use of existing ones.

Change is a universal law. Methods of accreditation, like schools themselves, must be constantly changing if they are to keep up to date. Methods which are flexible in their application to a particular school, which recognize valid differences between schools and between their purposes and pupils, will be such as to be easily modified, also, with the passage of time and the benefit of experience.

14. The number of factors evaluated in the modern secondary school must be sufficiently large and varied to give valid evidence of worth in each of the main areas of the school's work.

This means that the accreditation of a school on the basis of a small number of rigid measures is insufficient to give a valid measure of all essential aspects of the educational program.

15. Accrediting procedures and materials must be brief enough in extent and convenient enough in form to be practicable for use in all secondary schools.

This principle must be considered in connection with the preceding one, and a proper balance be struck between the two. Materials must be brief enough to be usable but long enough to be valid. Extensive sampling is required, rather than complete measurement. The samples, however, must be significant factors that really characterize the school and have been proved to possess real discriminative value. Criteria should take as a model, not the photographer who with his lens takes in everything in sight, but the artist who skillfully selects the significant elements in the landscape and uses them to suggest details all of which do not appear explicitly on the canvas.

16. If criteria for evaluation are sufficiently flexible, extensive, and thorough, it is not essential that they be applied annually.

This means that complete evaluation of a school may need to be made only at regular or irregular intervals of several years. Changes of administration or other unusual conditions may justify reconsideration of accreditation at special times. Partial evaluations may be made at intervening periods. Continuous self-evaluation is important.

17. The basis and methods of accreditation should be such as to require interest and participation in the process on the part of the entire professional and non-professional staffs of the school.

This means that the basis of accreditation cannot be limited to statistical blanks filled out by clerical assistants, or even to information furnished by the principal alone. It should be a coöperative process involving mutual

criticism and suggestion by the entire staff. Criteria should be such as to stimulate frequent if not continuous consideration and discussion by the school staff regardless of whether or not a visit by a committee of competent educators is anticipated.

18. The primary function of accreditation by the state or regional association should be stimulation toward continuous growth and improvement, not merely inspection and admission to membership.

This means that the conception of the state or regional organization as an inspectorial or police agency gives way to one of mutual friendliness, helpfulness, and stimulation to constant improvement of all schools, good or poor. While accreditation for college admission may be based on relatively few factors, stimulation of a school to become a better school makes a much more extensive body of criteria both desirable and necessary. Such stimulation requires attention not only to such factors as may discriminate between the good school and the poor school but constant attention to all factors or elements common to all types of schools, now and in the future. Nothing is more common than essentials. Not all essentials discriminate, but they must not be neglected ; rather they, too, must be improved. Mere accreditation is not sufficient. It is simply the first step in a continuous process. In a democracy a school should not be satisfied with being *good:* it should strive constantly to become *better.*

Principles of Accrediting Schools and Colleges*

By George F. Zook
President of the American Council on Education

I have come this morning to talk about a very familiar subject to the members of this Association. Technically, I am not as competent to speak on the topic as presumably I was several years ago when I served first as Secretary of the Commission on Higher Institutions, and later as chairman of the committee in charge of a study of the standards and accrediting procedures of the higher institutions of the North Central Association. Those days, in the light of absorbing personal experiences during the past five years, seem rather far away now, though nonetheless real. If, therefore, I am at all competent to speak on this important subject this morning it must be as one who, for a time, has stood apart and watched others carry on. I hope that my perspective has improved, but you will know more about that in approximately thirty minutes.

It is a well-known fact that those who drew up the provisions of our Federal Constitution did not choose to confer upon the central government authority in education. Hence, in this important realm of public life authority was reserved to the states. The states in turn quickly conferred upon the local communities or privately controlled corporations responsibility for the conduct and support of schools. The charters of existing colleges with their extensive powers were also recognized.

Behind this localization of the control and support of education lurked not so much a desire on the part of the states to escape the responsibility for the financial support of schools and colleges as the intense conviction of the people, nurtured in decades of bitter experience, that education was so much of a personal affair, including its relation to religion, as to make it highly desirable to keep the control and support of education close at home. Indeed, to our forefathers the opportunity to educate oneself as he chose seemed to be an attribute of liberty itself, for which ideal many had endured trials and hardship from Plymouth Rock through the Revolution.

It is only, therefore, as we recreate for ourselves something of the intense desire for personal liberty which dominated the founding fathers that we we can understand the impassioned plea of Daniel Webster when the state legislature of New Hampshire attempted to interfere in the government of Dartmouth College. "It will be a dangerous, a most dangerous experiment" said he, "to hold colleges subject to the rise and fall of popular parties, and the fluctuations of political opinions. Benefactors will have no certainty of

* An address delivered before the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 31, 1938.

effecting the object of their bounty; and learned men will be deterred from devoting themselves to the service of such institutions, from the precarious title of their offices. Colleges and halls will be deserted by all better spirits, and become a theatre for the contentions of politics. Party and faction will be cherished in the places consecrated to piety and learning."

So thundered Daniel Webster in his concluding arguments before the United States Supreme Court in the famous Dartmouth College case nearly 120 years ago. The argument made a deep impression on the court. In the decision the Chief Justice, John Marshall, declared that "No man ever did or will found a college, believing at the time that an act of incorporation constitutes no security for the institution; believing that it is immediately to be deemed a public institution whose funds are to be governed and applied, not by the will of the donor, but by the will of the legislature. All such gifts are made in the pleasing, perhaps delusive hope, that the charity will flow forever in the channel which the givers have worked out for it."

Remembering the sentimental appeal for liberty of teaching that went with the founding of each of the colonial colleges by the several religious denominations and the deep emotions that were stirred by the issue of freedom which seemed to be at stake in the Dartmouth College decision a century and more ago, it is difficult to resist vigorous applause for every effort at self-determination and self-government undertaken in our schools and colleges.

Moreover, it is to be remembered that our schools and colleges, decade after decade, have been filled with wise men and true, that the education of young people is a professional task of the highest order, that it has been our universities through their faculties or through their graduates which have pushed the boundaries of knowledge deeper and deeper into the territory of ignorance and superstitition. Of all of our social agencies none has a greater or more unselfish zeal for public welfare than the schools and colleges. Indeed, none have used liberty more wisely or unselfishly in the public interest.

Yet a proper sense of candor compels one to admit that often complacency stealthily invades schools and colleges as well as other social institutions. Like old men, schools and colleges sometimes grow drowsy and go to sleep. They lose contact with their constituency. The world moves on, leaving them figuratively rubbing their eyes and wondering why the surroundings are so strange and quiet. There has never yet been an unchecked concentration of authority in any social enterprise, including schools and colleges, which did not lead sooner or later to a lack of appreciation of public needs and a failure to discern the wise course of action.

Hence, nowhere, even in the democratic countries, does the voice of institutional freedom speak out with such challenging clarity today as seemed necessary 120 years ago. The individual comes to realize that there are

advantages to be had from social living even though he may have to surrender certain liberties. What is true of individuals holds equally true for institutions, both business and educational.

While the Dartmouth College decision seemed to many at the time a veritable rock of educational liberty, it also served to warn the rising democratic sentiment that if it wished to make college education serve its purposes it must be careful to leave a way for future public opinion to express itself. Hence, states began to restrict the liberties given to individual colleges in charters. In some instances, legislatures placed authority relative to institutional powers in the hands of a board or commission. In others, the state constitution specifically reserved the right to amend or modify the powers which may be exercised by colleges founded thereafter. Therefore, when the Berea College case came up for decision eighty years later, the courts made a very different disposition of the matter. The authority of the state to regulate the affairs of the college was vindicated. Berea College was subjected to the social requirements of the people of Kentucky. While we may still accept it as a fortunate circumstance that many colleges through the Dartmouth College decision were guaranteed their liberties, there can be no doubt that the social philosophy behind the Berea College case is equally, if not more, representative of the present genius of the American people than that so ably set forth by Daniel Webster more than a century ago.

Finally, the rapid extension of public education through universities, land grant colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, as well as elementary and secondary schools, is merely another way of declaring the extensive interest which the public has in the conduct of education as well as in all other phases of social life.

I do not believe, therefore, that it is any more possible for a college or a school to live in "splendid isolation" than it is for a country or an individual to do so. Changes in national economic circumstances and modifications of popular social philosophy play an unending tattoo on all social institutions, including our schools and colleges. Ultimately, upon every one of them public opinion leaves its impression; and each goes about the business responding to it, some sooner, some later. Within the last century and a quarter education has come to be regarded as one of the clearest illustrations of collective responsibility. Therefore, I am convinced that one must accept a large amount of social control in all forms of education.

I have spoken at some length concerning the historical background of schools and colleges in this country because I wished to bring out as clearly as possible that the problem of accrediting is merely an aspect of the age-old question as to who shall control schools and colleges.

My first thesis, therefore, is to point out the fact that whatever in the way of educational facilities the people through statutes, acts of incorporation,

or constitutional provisions authorize or establish, the people may and will at times modify or abolish. The manner in which the people exercise this control and the degree of wisdom exhibited may vary greatly, but it is nonetheless real and important.

The regular and final method which the American people use for the expression of their views on education as well as on all other matters of common concern is the law. Year after year, state legislative mills composed of the elected agents of the people grind out volumes of laws, among which one sometimes finds a law dealing with education. Occasionally, in the mass of this state legislation one finds real trends of policy not always in line with the desires of educational administrators; as, for example, the increasing centralization of the administration of public higher education within the states. In some of these matters the state legislatures have been wiser than college administrators and boards of trustees combined. State legislatures as a means of expressing public opinion about education are not, therefore, a complete failure. They certainly have not been guilty of all the apprehensions of Daniel Webster.

In general, however, state legislation is not a successful method of keeping schools and colleges abreast of public needs and desires. Legislatures are too far away from and too little acquainted with the problems involved to give a great deal of intelligent attention to them. As a means of preserving quality of work within institutions, they are, except in minor instances, a total failure. Even when some good is accomplished temporarily by writing standards into the law relative, for example, to the endowment required of a college or prescribed subjects in the school curriculum, these standards soon prove to be inadequate or, worse, out-of-date.

It is an interesting paradox that, while people through their constituted authorities, are unwilling to interfere directly with the processes and teaching of educational institutions, they may and often do refuse to accept their product.

I do not refer merely to temporary public opinion, but to the requirements set down in laws and regulations defining not only the quality and character of knowledge which one must have to practice a profession such as medicine or teaching, but also the kind of a school or college in which he must secure his training. Thus, the regulation of educational institutions, in which the people refuse to engage directly, is nevertheless accomplished almost as certainly and definitely by the indirect method of regulating and limiting those who may enter the professions as if it had been done directly.

The best that the law can do for the schools and colleges, outside of legalizing the establishment of their governing boards, is to authorize the creation of public officials who have power to set up certain requirements for the maintenance of proper standards of educational work. The regulations of state authorities are much better than formal legislative law because

regulations can be and generally are more flexible than statute law. Furthermore, the officials who make them are closer to and understand the problems better. They may even, indeed in some instances often do, carry on extensive study of situations before issuing their decrees or they may lean heavily on the advice of the accrediting agencies.

Up to this point I have endeavored to show that schools and colleges are organizations established by society for a social purpose, and that no matter how much legal liberty they may enjoy they must and should, just as in the case of other social institutions, be subjected constantly to the scrutiny, criticism, and even regulation of the society in which they live and which they serve. I am convinced, therefore, that in general it is this criticism and regulation which helps powerfully to keep them abreast of changing social needs. All of these agencies of society, the governing boards of schools and colleges, the laws passed by state legislatures, and the regulations of state educational authorities, have exhibited obvious deficiencies. While I am convinced that all of these agencies of society have contributed notably to the success and progress of schools and colleges, yet experience shows us that they are not enough. Particularly they are ineffective in the realm of educational quality.

In the realm of quality of educational work there is the same need of effective means of criticism which will result in action as in other aspects of its activities. Obviously in this respect, only the schools and colleges themselves acting jointly are in a position to formulate the best practices and the most accepted standards. Such a demand and such a realization give rise to what we know now as the accrediting agency. An accrediting association such as the Southern Association is the coöperative venture of a large number of schools and colleges which are earnestly seeking first to ascertain what are the best standards of educational work, and secondly what are the effective ways and means of bringing these standards to the attention of the schools and colleges within its constituency. What are its virtues as against other agencies of society? In the first place, it serves as a protection to institutions against the hasty and ill-advised actions of state legislatures and even state educational authorities. Indeed, its standards and lists of accredited institutions help local authorities to elevate the tone and performance of local institutions which would otherwise be impossible. Secondly, it is not a debating society only. It has enough authority so that its conclusions carry weight. It can get something done. Finally, its conclusions and its actions are the coöperative work of the institutions themselves and as such are subject to constant mutual criticism and modification. If we had no such agency we could better appreciate how sorely they would be needed. The fact that they grow in importance yearly in spite of obvious deficiencies is a testimonial to the continued need of them in this country.

I hope that this summary of the accrediting situation brings us down to date and that it may serve also to convince you of the very sympathetic attitude which I bear toward the whole accrediting movement. If so, I can approach a discussion of some of the problems facing accrediting agencies as a friend of the family.

As a general background for what I have to say, may I venture an observation which I am sure is widely held among reputable American educators; namely, that notwithstanding a very useful past the accrediting associations of this country are now unprogressive in educational philosophy, unscientific in procedure, and a possible impediment to educational progress. They are indeed more feared than they are respected. This is a very serious charge which if only partially true deserves our serious consideration. May I specify a few particulars? The quantitative standards for approving schools and colleges used by most accrediting associations are now out of date and thoroughly unreliable. In discussing this statement I wish first of all to recognize the situation which led accrediting associations in the beginning to adopt the familiar quantitative type of standard. It was in part fear of subject matter control through examinations or otherwise which drove the accrediting associations to exercise their control through a definition of the minimum external conditions under which schools and colleges might operate. They believed that they could in this way improve the quality of the educational process without breaking the great American tradition of freedom in teaching. There is another explanation of this situation which I believe to be purely psychological. Anyone who has ever attended a faculty meeting, or sat in the sessions of a state legislature, or gazed in awe at the operations of one of our accrediting agencies will not have to be reminded how instinctive it seems to be for well-intentioned, presumably intelligent people to seek some panacea in the form of a law or a rule which will reduce to as near zero as possible the amount of thought and judgment necessary to the solution of each individual problem as it arises. The human mind hopes to attain an abstract social ideal or goal through a continued process of fiddling with the attendant machinery.

Notwithstanding these factors which naturally played such a large part in determining the character of the standards developed in the early days, I am convinced that the time has now arrived when accrediting agencies should eliminate the old quantitative standards and go over completely to a qualitative evaluation of the processes and product of schools and colleges. What was neither possible nor necessary twenty-five years ago has become desirable today. We have now reached a stage of development in American education when we are able to apply more reliable measures of individual diagnosis and growth and when judgments both as to individual and institutional status can be rendered much more reliably than in those early

days. We can and we should cast off quantitative standards in favor of qualitative criteria in evaluating the work of higher institutions.

Some years ago, as you know, the North Central Association decided to ascertain whether there was any validity in the old-type quantitative standard (endowment, fifteen units of admission, 120 semester hours, and the like) and if not, whether qualitative criteria which was both dependable and feasible in the accrediting process could be substituted. Suffice it to say that at the end of a three-year period those who were in charge of the study unanimously reached the conclusion that there was not a single one of the old quantitative standards that could be validated against any of the qualitative measures which were applied to the institutions. It was a complete confirmation of what most people had long suspected. Immediately thereafter the old quantitative standards of the North Central Association were thrown out of the window, bag and baggage.

I conclude this part of the discussion, therefore, with the simple statement that at this advanced stage of development in accrediting there is no need for outworn quantitative measures and that we should hasten to substitute therefor modern qualitative methods of evaluation. Unless the accrediting associations respond to some such challenge as this, I am convinced that they will continue to lose caste with the leaders of American education. It has, therefore, been particularly gratifying to me to watch the very cordial coöperation of this Association in the coöperative study of secondary school standards, which seems to me to have been exceedingly well conceived and directed, and to contemplate the possibility of substituting in this Association and other similar organizations criteria and accrediting procedures in the secondary school field far superior to those now in use.

The second charge which one hears frequently is the fact that the standards of the accrediting associations are minimum standards and that little or nothing is done to stimulate constant improvement among the better schools and colleges. In many instances this charge seems to me to be substantially true. I am convinced that the period for policing schools and colleges is about over or, to be a bit more accurate, it is steadily growing less important. I wonder if the time has not come in our accrediting associations when there is need for the doctor as well as the policeman. One has a very different attitude toward the policeman who knocks at his door than he has toward the doctor. The former comes to compel an individual to meet an arbitrary minimum standard; the other to help him through education and advice. In other words, I believe that any accrediting association which fails to carry on a program of stimulation and improvement for the good and the best institutions, as well as to sit in judgment at the gates of the elect, will deserve to lose the interest of its better members. This is a challenge which I believe to contain implications of utmost significance to the future of this and other similar associations.

If this assertion is true, you have a right to ask me to specify what types of activities which can be carried on by the accrediting associations will be stimulating in character and which may reasonably be expected to result in improvements even in the best institutions.

First, it is my belief that each school or college, both those seeking accreditment and those already accredited, should be permitted and required to select its own peculiar objectives. One of the chief criticisms leveled at the accrediting associations is that they tend to standardize—to reduce to a uniform level or type of organization—a great variety of institutions whose individuality ought to be encouraged rather than suppressed. While I do not believe that this suppression has actually resulted in much harm in the regional associations, experience shows clearly that where undertaken in a serious spirit, both in the North Central survey and in the present coöperative study of secondary school standards and accrediting procedures, there is nothing more stimulating and profitable to the individual school or college. Such a procedure should be encouraged and required by every accrediting association. It would go a long way toward removing justifiable criticism of present practices.

Secondly, the accrediting associations should encourage and insist upon well conceived and continuous study of, and experimentation with, new and promising educational procedures within individual schools and colleges. We are living in a rapidly changing social and economic situation. Schools and colleges are faced with a legion of problems. Some of them are giving these problems serious attention. Others, perhaps a larger number, are asleep or at best only vaguely conscious of what is going on round about them. An accrediting association cannot and should not attempt to tell an individual school or college what its particular program should be, but it can and should expect individual institutions to carry on studies and experiments relative to its problems on the basis of which it may modify its program.

Such liberty of experimentation has long been recognized as basic to progress in the sciences. It is just as necessary in the organization of instruction for students or any other educational procedure, a fact which was thoroughly recognized in the excellent survey on medical education some years ago in the following words, "the immediate need was to secure relief, if possible, from the restraint and burden of external regulations, particularly those of the various state licensing bodies regulating the details of medical training, and to stimulate experimentation in medical education."[1]

The request for freedom made by the commission in charge of the survey in 1925 was granted both by the Federation of State Medical Boards and the Association of American Medical Colleges. According to Dr. S. P. Capen, a member of the Commission, the response of the medical schools

[1] *Medical Education*, p. 4.

to this grant of freedom was immediate and widespread. "More extensive and fruitful experimentation," said he, "has been carried on in the last seven years than in any previous period of similar length."[2]

I do not hold, of course, that the situation in the regional associations is altogether comparable with that described above, but wherever there is serious study of our educational problems one always experiences a sense of satisfaction and hope. The accrediting associations should not only permit it but they should encourage it as a continuous part of their program. If they will get busy at it they will go a long way toward regaining prestige and respect in American education.

The third matter to which I wish to call your attention is the fact that there are getting to be altogether too many accrediting associations and that their demands on individual institutions, particularly the larger and more complex ones, are uneven and arbitrary according to the vagaries of the particular association concerned or the inspectors sent to visit them. First, it was the major divisions of an institution such as liberal arts, medicine, and law with which we were concerned in accrediting. Then the smaller divisions, such as nursing, library science, journalism, social work and the like, got busy. The engineers carried the segmentation process of accrediting one step further by passing on and listing curricula within the engineering colleges, and now the chemists, after two years of study, threaten to break out with standards and procedures for accrediting the departments of chemistry. In fact, if I understand the situation correctly, that is exactly what is expected to happen at the annual meeting of the American Chemical Society here in Dallas in about ten days. We have only the departments of French, botany, physics, history, economics, mathematics, and their further segmentation into particular courses such as English, economic history, calculus, invertebrate zoölogy, money and banking, theory of light, and a few hundred other departments and courses to accredit in order to make life more interesting for harassed college presidents!

Each of these efforts has been begun with the laudable ambition of raising the quality of work within the divisions or departments concerned. Each wishes to protect itself against the encroachments of other divisions which have developed rapidly as a result possibly of the pressure exerted by an accrediting agency operating in that field. It reminds one of the stupid scramble in Europe to build up higher and higher tariff walls following the World War. In the end everybody suffered rather than benefitted.

So it is in our present accrediting situation. Who is there today who is thinking of the institution as a whole and who is planning the coördinated development of the entire institution according to the needs of its constituency rather than to the arbitrary requirements of external accrediting

[2] Proceedings of the Annual Congress of Medical Education and Licensure, Chicago, February 13 and 14, 1933.

agencies, nearly all of which are using out of date quantitative standards and unscientific procedure? Frankly, I do not believe that we should allow this development to go ahead unchecked and unquestioned. It may be that the situation confronting our higher institutions deserves early and comprehensive study and consideration.

But what lesson is there in this situation for the several regional accrediting associations? The regional associations should themselves strive to be thoroughly comprehensive in their accrediting activities, especially on the undergraduate level. It was a long time before teachers' colleges and junior colleges were recognized by the regional associations. Even now they do not receive the attention they should. I have often heard that the science departments are neglected. To whatever extent this assertion is true it should be corrected. The schools of music and art have knocked at the doors of the regional associations for years. It is a mistake to drive them into the formation of accrediting agencies of their own, especially since they are concerned with the training of teachers for the secondary schools. The Master's degree is coming to be regarded more largely as the extension of senior college work than it is the beginning of work toward the Ph.D. degree. If this is true the circumstances under which Master's degrees are given should be included more definitely in the accrediting procedures of the regional associations. And so one might go on to name a large number of situations in the undergraduate field the neglect of which has undoubtedly resulted in the development of a larger number of specialized accrediting agencies than would otherwise have been established. If, therefore, we stop the present flood toward more accrediting agencies or indeed reduce the number of these efforts, it will be due largely, I am convinced, to the comprehensive conception of their tasks and to the superior processes of accrediting schools and colleges which are adopted and developed by the regional accrediting agencies.

Friends, I have attempted to set forth the basic factors which in a democracy should influence and control schools and colleges including the accrediting associations. I see great virtue in them, not so much for what they are now, but for what they have been in the past and may become in the future. In the most friendly spirit I have endeavored to present a few situations which seem to me to challenge both our intelligence and determination and which, if corrected, would assist most significantly in the solution of many problems in American education.

Articulation of the High School and the College*

By Thomas H. Briggs

Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

The problem of articulating the high school and the college is not new. I have a distinct recollection of hearing it discussed in many meetings before this, and a reference to the Educational Index finds three pages of fine print entries of articles published on the topic in three years. Apparently there is a feeling that the problem is not yet solved. And yet the solution is very simple in principle and appallingly difficult to effect.

Articulation implies adjustment by at least two elements to achieve a desired unity of function. It should not mean, as some narrow enthusiasts have argued, that either the humerus should be crushed and remade to articulate with the scapula, or the reverse. There needs to be adjustment in both elements so that they will fit together for effectively achieving a commonly understood and a commonly desired purpose. It is this purpose that gives meaning and significance to each of the elements and that determines what they should be and do. Unless there is definite agreement on what the ultimate purpose is, there is no need of any further discussion of the detailed means of securing articulation. It is pointless, futile, and irritating.

The earliest secondary schools had none of this problem. They were established and maintained to prepare for the college, the curriculum of which was narrow, definite, fixed, and well understood. The purpose of that curriculum may not have been a sound one and it may have been ineffectively achieved, but every one knew precisely what it was, the mastery of a small corpus of traditional subject matter. If one got that formal mastery, he was educated, whether or not he ever manifested possession in later use. If he possessed any other developed powers, he was not educated. And that was all that there was to it. The Latin Grammar School prepared for that formal mastery; it accepted no other responsibility. And there was no problem of articulation.

The problem came when the colleges began to enlarge their offerings and when the secondary schools began to attempt concurrently the education of boys and, later, girls too, who had either no desire or no competence for the kind of discipline that the old curriculum provided. It is interesting to read in the neglected pages of the history of our education that the East, now the lair of the conservative college preparation fetish, and also the South at first took the position that the public high school could never ex-

* An address delivered before the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 31, 1938.

pect successfully to prepare boys and girls for college. The presidents of both Yale and Harvard maintained that the high schools should attempt merely to educate youth who would not or could not pursue their studies in higher institutions. It was the democratic Middle West that vigorously maintained the opposite position. It determined that its boys and girls should have as good an opportunity as those anywhere else in the country. And as there were few academies, the high schools should be college preparatory. What changes come about in a half century!

It is generally recognized now that the public high school has two main functions: the preparation of some youth for college and the furnishing of a terminal education of varying lengths for all others. At various times it has been suggested that the two objectives could and should be sought concurrently. The Committee of Ten made the statement that what is good for education is equally good for college preparation, but within a half generation that statement had been generally reversed in the minds of both the profession and the laity to mean that what is good for college entrance is equally good for education for life. As college entrance requirements are today, the reversed statement is approved by only the few who, with eyes fixed backward, refuse to see the ineffective lack of persistence and application of most of the required learning in the lives of both those who went to college and of those who did not. If the college curriculum were merely an extension of the education that is planned for making all life richer and more effective, the problem of articulation would be tremendously simplified. But for the most part it continues to be an increasingly specialized preparation for the increasingly narrowed activities of an increasingly selected fraction of the population.

The public high schools today have in one category two classes of pupils—those who in varying degree are competent to be successful with the curricula offered by colleges, and those who are not. In another category they have three classes of pupils: those who have no intention of going to college, those who have every expectation of doing so, and those who are uncertain, many of the last group having given little thought to the matter. The overlapping groups in the two categories embarrassingly complicate the problem. Those who are designed by their parents for higher institutions of learning—I advisedly do not say for higher education—have frequently manifested no competence that warrants their ambition, but they must be prepared or there is criticism of the high school and perhaps pressure that leads to changes in personnel. Those who are highly gifted and yet are not convinced that colleges have anything of value for them constitute a group who give little trouble to the administration, though they are perhaps the richest of the nation's unused assets. The undecided group tend toward the preparatory curriculum, not because they want what it offers, but because it is definite

and respectable, and they do not know what may turn up. Usually nothing does, and they are prepared for nothing.

The larger the school, of course, the easier it is to provide for the several groups. But adequately varied provisions in differentiated curricula have for various reasons seldom been made. The reasons given are usually that there is a lack of money and of time; the real reason is, more probably, that the administration does not know what to offer. It is much easier to continue to administer a preparatory curriculum that is shaped and refined by years of development than it is to invent a new one, which in its beginnings must of necessity be uneven, experimental, and of uncertain values. We should just as well frankly face the unpleasant fact that a great many educators who most loudly complain of the restrictions of college requirements would not know what to teach or how confidently to proceed toward developing new materials of instruction if all requirements were removed. "College requirements" are too frequently an excuse and not a reason for curriculum induration.

I make this charge with full appreciation of the adventurous pioneer work done by some schools and of the steady trend to improve the educational values of even the most conventional subjects. But the individual teacher and even the individual school can proceed only a little way in reform while carrying the full-time load of routine work, and neither can proceed with confidence nor with assurance of successful direction until there is developed a set of fundamental principles that receive general understanding and approval by both the laity and the profession. Some day we are coming to recognize this; and then we shall provide for the same kind of expert professional help and direction in making curricula as we now provide for such physical matters as plant construction and budget making. So far the professional associations and state departments of education have largely dodged the curriculum because they realize its difficulties and dangers, because they know that they have not agreed on the fundamental principles, and because the school people in the field complacently refuse to exert the necessary pressure to get action.

The large schools, I say, have the numbers that facilitate differentiation of many kinds. The small schools can do little, some can do nothing, in providing varied offerings suitable to all youth. But the underlying principle is the same in all schools, large or small. When adequate differentiation is impossible, what group shall the school primarily attempt to serve? The answer is that the school should attempt primarily to serve no group of pupils, either the academically gifted or the others; its responsibility is to expend the public money and to educate all children so as to make the largest contribution to the supporting society. It should attempt to make every youth better able and better disposed to contribute maximally now and

later to make the community a better place in which to live and in which to make a living.

This is an illustration of the sort of principle which a few moments ago I stated is necessary to direct thinking about education and to direct the work of both individual teachers and experts who set about making the new curricula for all education, whether in elementary or secondary schools or in the colleges. There is likely to be little dissent from the proposed principle, for obviously there is no justification for the expenditure of public funds for education unless there is an expectation that the public will get not only a benefit but also the maximum benefit to itself in return for its money. If the greatest return to society is likely to come from preparing a few for college, as the college is or as it can be developed, then that is what high schools should attempt to do. If, on the other hand, the investment of public funds for education is likely to pay its largest dividends to society when the attempt is seriously and steadily made to develop each and every individual so that he can make his largest possible contribution to the preservation and the promotion of the interests of society, the proper emphasis is clearly indicated.

There is no real conflict between the individual and society, though superficial thinking may at first consider that there is. It can easily be seen that what the individual (or his parents) thinks will be of most immediate personal benefit to him may not at all insure the maximum contribution to the supporting society. Of course society cannot be profited unless the individual is first developed in ways that are good for him. It is to society's interest that he be made the best that his potentialities permit in order that he may make the largest possible return to his alma mater, the supporting social group. When there is any conflict of interest, that of society, which pays the bill, must be paramount.

Such a principle as this makes the problem of articulation as ordinarily considered of small significance. If the public school, from the elementary grades through the university, seriously and consistently sought to prepare individuals not only to make but also to want to make their maximum contribution to the welfare of society, it would be a unity, all of its parts articulating for a commonly desired end. On this basis education could more easily be made the "gradual, continuous, unitary process" that the Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education recommends that it should be.

So much for the high schools. The problem of articulation is acute for them primarily because they have never realized that their prime responsibility is to make youth better able and better disposed to contribute to the welfare of the supporting society, or having realized it, they have never seriously and boldly attempted to break with tradition and to achieve their responsibility. I have said that the task as a whole is too great for any

teacher or for any school alone to accomplish in its entirety; but every teacher and every school can do something, can do much, indeed, by courageously trying to determine what the needs of society are and what its ideals demand. When enough schools make the attempt they will at the same time make evident the impelling need of central agencies carrying on with financial support, with larger resources of ingenuity. They will make evident, too, the necessity of aid especially to small high schools to bend their energies primarily to the development of the majority of their students, whatever their type of natural inheritance and their ambition. I envisage the time when there are central high schools, to which transportation and perhaps in which board and lodging are provided, for the minority of students who can be collected for such education as suits their especial talents and needs.

Now, what are the peculiar functions of the academic colleges? I do not know any more difficult task than for an intelligent parent to find how one college differs from another and which one is best for his own son or daughter, whose abilities and ambitions presumably he knows and has attempted to evaluate. The statements in catalogues and in other such literature are peculiarly alike, abounding in such terms as "liberal education," "culture," "a wholesome social atmosphere," and the like, none of them defined with sufficient definiteness to enable a parent to know whether they mean anything pragmatic or not. Nor do the statements of courses as a rule give much further information. All of the colleges offer French, the calculus, physics, and economics, but the inquiring parent can seldom learn just what they are intended to contribute to the development of his offspring and how the offerings on one campus are superior to those on another.

Unfortunately many parents are neither intelligent nor conscientious when selecting a college. Instead of asking what a son or daughter needs to develop into a cultured human being and seeking to find an institution that promises most effectively to forward that development, parents often take the program for granted or really are not interested in it. Some parents are seeking a vague thing that they think of as intellectual or social prestige, without ever considering how or whether it has manifested itself beneficently in those who have had the experience; some are seeking an asylum for their children; some wish them to make acquaintances—"contacts," I believe they are called—who may be helpful in business. And some frankly say they are not concerned with lectures, laboratory, or library, which they recognize must be endured in order that social development may progress. Perhaps for them we need a new type of institution, a sort of youthful country club in which no academic requirements will interfere with the social life and the extracurricular activities. Some wag has suggested that a lot of sham and embarrassment might be avoided if every youth with such ambition were at entrance given a degree—A.B. for a boy and A.G. for a girl—

and thus freed from the necessity of ever attending a lecture or opening a book. The problem of sensibly articulating the high school and the college will never be seriously attacked or sensibly solved until parents and students really want what the colleges have clearly announced that they are skilfully and consistently seeking to develop.

The suspicion is growing in many minds that the academic colleges are no more certain of their peculiar and justifying functions than are the high schools. A first step that they need to take is to clarify their minds on this point, to clarify them so that they can make both parents and students understand precisely to what their programs lead. The time is passing when intelligent men and women planning for the best development of their children can be persuaded by terms that are more resonant and traditionally respectable than clear and convincing. The colleges need not only to define their functions but also to make them the determiners of all the programs that they offer.

When they have done this, the problem of articulation again becomes clearer. It is exceedingly difficult to correlate two variables that are neither understood nor predictable. It is easy enough to articulate one's gait in the daytime with a normal man walking steadily on a pavement in a known direction. It is quite another thing to articulate it at night with that of an erratic drunkard stumbling over an uneven terrain. The figure exaggerates a bit, but it may serve to indicate some of the difficulties that we face when discussing the problem of articulating the high school and the academic college.

I would not leave the impression that there are not some colleges, small as well as large, which recognize the traditional haze in which they have been working and which are making valiant efforts to come out into the light. A few that I might name have recently been struggling backward into mediaeval darkness. But at least a prospective patron can know what they are attempting to do and how they differ in their ideals and programs from others that have clarified their minds as to the functions of higher education.

The colleges want students. That is evidenced by their activities during recent years to recruit their ranks, sometimes by means that are not altogether dignified. I am not talking now about recruiting those pseudo-students whose chief qualifications are that they can be outstanding in some extracurricular activity. I am talking about the recruiting of those boys and girls who go to college with ambition for that more or less well understood thing called a liberal education. But what sort of student does the college want? How can that question be answered until the college has defined its functions, until it has decided precisely the sort of cultured men and women it wishes to return to the world?

It is no secret that many colleges have permitted and even encouraged

the admission of youth who have manifested no evidence that they either want or are likely to profit by the curriculum that is offered. Why? Chiefly, I suspect, because these colleges have not recognized just what they are attempting to achieve. They cannot intelligently set up entrance requirements until they do. An entrance requirement as a hurdle over which one gets into college and then may neglect and forget is one thing; a requirement which selects those who, having had successful experience, want more of the same kind and on which the college builds continuously and systematically is quite another thing, one highly to be desired. No high school could object to a requirement of this latter kind; no prospective student could fail to welcome an invitation to manifest his competence to do what he wishes to continue to do. Too many requirements have been of the kind that one "got by" so that he would not have to do again what he has never at any time wanted to do at all.

The evidence most cited as a failure of articulation is of two kinds. First is the pressure by the colleges to have their requirements taught with a resultant restriction on the high schools. Many feel that unhampered they can adequately prepare for college and at the same time give a richer education than the requirements permit. Some secondary schools already do this. In an exclusive, high-priced preparatory school in the East I found two teachers, one in English and one in Greek, doing as fine a job as one could want to see in developing boys in real education, and their product had no difficulty getting into college. Moreover, they stayed there and continued their favorite studies with eminent success.

It is extremely doubtful if able teachers are much restricted by requirements when teaching subjects that are approved for admission. The charge of restriction too often comes from those who would do nothing different if all requirements were removed. More and more the better colleges are accepting and approving students rather than courses. If they are convinced that a young man or young woman is competent and eager for what they have to offer, they realize that it is foolish not to waive requirements that have not been met to the letter of the law. But they are not to be criticized for demanding convincing evidence, and this the high schools should be willing and able to give. There are cases, of course, of stubborn, shortsighted admissions officers; but the tendency is clearly toward a more liberal a more intelligent policy.

The more important and disastrous result of the college entrance requirements is that high schools feel forced to provide them even though only a minority of the students are competent for, or expectant of, advanced education. For this public pressure is largely to blame. In the popular mind education is too largely identified with the traditional academic subjects, and the failure of a few students to gain admission to college or to be successful there is impressive evidence that the high school is at fault. It may

or it may not be. The college itself by its faulty use of an admission technique or by poor instruction may be responsible, at least in part. But the real question to be considered frankly and fully is : does the high school have a sound educational program that is better than the traditional requirements for youth whether college bound or not? If it does have such a program, it is in duty bound to popularize it in the community so that it is recognized as promising rich dividends on the social investment. If the school can and will furnish convincing evidence that its novel program is making youth better able and better disposed to contribute to the betterment of society, it will find public support for all the freedom that it needs. Moreover, the more enlightened colleges, the only ones worth attending, will not only be willing but also eager to accept its graduates. If the school has not developed such a program, it would just as well follow the college prescriptions as not.

The second kind of evidence of inarticulation is in the failure of students who are admitted to college. The amount of failure we know is lamentably and wastefully large. For both academic and moral failure the college and the high school must share the blame. The latter may have given an inadequate preparation either in basic information or in methods of study. The offerings, the methods of teaching, and the requirements by the colleges are well-known ; and while the high school may not wholly approve of them, it accepts an obligation to prepare students to meet the situation as it exists. This does not mean, of course, that the high school, acting independently or through such an association as this, abrogates its right and its duty to bring such pressure to bear as will influence the college to better any or all of these conditions and practices. It simply means that pending improvement it should prepare youth to meet them successfully. If it is known that freshmen will be required to take notes from lectures, why should the high school not give some preliminary training in how to do it well? This is a skill that it is important for one to possess whether he goes to college or not. If it is known that the freshman will have great freedom in budgeting his time and in studying with a large amount of independence, why should the high school not train him in doing so with economy and with effectiveness? Every person after leaving school will have to do this for himself anyway. The inarticulation here can be greatly decreased if the high school is realistic enough to accept the challenge of practices as they exist and if the college will begin where the high school left off, wherever that may be, and carry on conscientiously and skilfully from that point.

The colleges would be in a better position to criticize the work of the high school if they stopped their duplication in introductory courses of what many students have already had and if they built on the courses that they have required. It is well known that in many colleges students who have

had good preparation in English or history or science or advanced mathematics are for college convenience thrown into sections with other students inadequately or not at all trained in these subjects. No wonder there is inarticulation. In no few instances students are required to present for admission what is never used later by the college. One famous college for women requires for admission four years of Latin, and then permits nine of every ten freshmen to take no more of the study. Their four years of preparation has just got to the point at which they can begin to get the major profit from it. As one wit said, in that time he had learned merely to say, "I'm a beau, I'm a bass, I'm a bat." Requirements would be more respectable and respected if the colleges consistently manifested that they are necessary for advanced work.

The moral failure of freshmen in college is a more serious evidence of inarticulation than is generally recognized. I am far from charging moral delinquency to all, or even to a majority, of American youth. As a matter of fact, I think they are morally more sound than ever before. But the exceptions are conspicuous and challenging. For this failure, too, both high school and college must share the blame. Every schoolman knows the temptations that come with increased freedom, when the restrictions of the home are not effectively continued by the college. The same increase of freedom comes when the boy leaves home for work. The high school, then, has a responsibility, increasing especially with the too frequent breakdown of wholesome influences in the home, for devoting a major part of its energies and skills to developing understanding of moral problems and both the ability and the inclination to intelligent self-control. Whatever its success, the college assumes the responsibility, which I think it is increasingly accepting, to begin where the high school left off. It cannot be successful merely by having daily prayers at chapel. It needs officers of understanding, wisdom, sympathy with youth, and abundant time to devote to promoting the moral welfare and growth of every individual student. Probably those most in need of help are not those who are sent to the dean's office for mischief caused by an exuberance of spirit or by boredom from lectures and assignments that have been presented with insufficient skill to reveal their worth.

The means that have most frequently been used to select students for college admission have not, as is generally recognized, been satisfactory. A curriculum required at least in part is reasonable, but it is justifiable only if it is necessary for advanced work and if it is consistently used for that purpose. As we have seen, it is not always so justified. No requirement will be satisfactory until both high school and college more definitely agree on the meaning of education and each on its peculiar functions contributing to it. When there is such agreement, admission examinations using the best of modern techniques will be more justifiable, and high school officers

will be more intelligent and more honest in making recommendations on the certificate plan. This plan has been especially weak in that the basis of accrediting has been uncertain and fallacious. Remmers has shown that the graduates of non-approved schools do about as well at Purdue as graduates of those schools that have met standards that have no substantial justification. The one important factor is the student—his natural ability and his acquired attitudes and habits of work.

This being true, we are coming more and more to depend upon an accumulated personnel record of each candidate for college. From the beginning of his first year each student in a high school should have a dossier in which is recorded not only his record of success in his studies, but also of his methods of work, his interests, his attitudes, his handicaps and efforts to overcome them, his unusual qualities that indicate the respects in which he is likely to succeed or to fail in study, in work, and in his relations with his fellow man. The anecdotes advocated and used by the Rochester Institute of Mechanic Arts are especially valuable. Such a dossier will soon become unwieldy in its bulk, so that periodically the student's adviser should make a digest of what seems to be significant. An admissions officer will find in such a series of well-made digests more information of value to indicate whether the candidate is a promising risk than in all the examinations that he and his associates are likely to be able to devise.

However complex and persistent the problem of articulation between high school and college is, its solution lies in a relatively simple, though difficult, procedure. All the improvements of personal relationships and of examinations or of certification procedures are futile without it. And that procedure is first of all the clarification of the meaning of education, on all levels, from the kindergarten through the college, and of all kinds, cultural as well as vocational. We should be as ready with a clear and pragmatic definition as we are to use the word. That we are not so ready may be evidenced by the simple experiment of asking a dozen educators for the definition that directs and determines any details of their programs. Proceeding from such a definition we move on to application of the undisputable principle that public education is justified only as it contributes maximally to the well-being and the betterment of society. We are on unstable ground until after earnest search, aided by all the expert judgment available, we know what the ideals and needs of democratic society are and until we have marshaled all the forces of public education to achieve the former and to satisfy the latter. With these bases we shall be in a position to attack the problems of articulation with some assurance of achieving an education that is "a gradual, continuous, unitary process."

The Education of Teachers as an All-Institution Responsibility as Planned at the University of North Carolina*

By Harl R. Douglass

Kenan Professor of Secondary Education and Chairman of Division of Teacher Education, University of North Carolina

I believe we all have sensed the fact that within recent years the need for improvement of the plans and facilities for the education of teachers has become much more generally recognized and more keenly felt, particularly with respect to the education of high school teachers. Among the factors which we can readily identify as being largely responsible for this attitude are the three mentioned below. Others will be indicated later in this paper.

1. The curriculum of the high school, never an effective, thought-out plan for serving the needs of society or of those who attended high school, has, in the last few decades, become increasingly in need of revision and readjustment.

2. Important changes and developments in American life have radically changed not only the responsibilities of the schools but also the relative usefulness of what was being taught there. The nature and type of influence which the home, the church, and means of communication exert upon the school-going youngster have also undergone transformation in recent decades.

3. There has been a great influx into secondary and higher schools of young people whose interests, capacities, home environments, future, and recreational, home, and vocational life are markedly different from those of the select few of superior ability and intellectual interests, who, previous to 1890 or 1900, constituted the tenth of the high school student body.

Evidences of increased consciousness of the need for reform in the education of teachers may be seen in such events, movements, and publications as the National Survey of the Education of Teachers and its reports published in 1932-34, the Commission of the American Historical Association and its reports, appearing in 1934-37, the work of the Committee on the Subject-Matter Education of Teachers, appointed in 1934 by the North Central Association of College and Secondary Schools, and the Teacher-Education Study now being carried on by the American Council on Education, aided by a grant from the General Education Board. I hope to see

* An address delivered before the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 31, 1938.

this Association also play its part in the improvement of teacher education.

It has become increasingly obvious that any attempts to improve the quality, or otherwise to change the nature of the products of the high schools, depend squarely upon the interest, background, and competence of the classroom teachers through whom all ideas and plans for changes in educational content and methods must be made effective. Plan after plan for the improvement of the schools has been seriously limited, if not completely frustrated, by reason of the limitations of the preparation of the teachers and administrators.

In addition to the three factors related to the needs for reform in the high school curriculum, a recognition of the relative neglect of the problems of subject-matter education of teachers has contributed to the increased attention now being given to problems of teacher training. In the period roughly from 1875-1935, movements and plans for improving the quality of teachers centered largely around increasing the amount of time spent in school or college beyond the elementary school, and in increasing and improving what has come to be called "professional training." Courses in child study, tests and measurements, methods of teaching, guidance, extracurricular activities, and school supervision and administration were developed and introduced. They multiplied, expanded, and improved, not only as a result of the appearance of better educated men and women in departments and schools of education, but also because of the development of scientific techniques and their application to the study of educational problems. The possibility for usefulness of these new materials for the professional education of teachers so impressed those in positions of leadership and influence in public education in the several states, and in the accrediting associations, that soon teachers were required to complete a minimum of study in professional courses as a prerequisite for a teaching certificate.

Among the results of these developments, namely the expansion of new teaching materials and courses in education, the requirements of professional training for teaching, and the establishment of schools and colleges of education, two outcomes are very pertinent to the subject of this paper:

1. The relative neglect of the problems relating to the nature and scope of the subject-matter preparation of teachers, and

2. An increasing suspicion, antagonism, and failure to coöperate intelligently between the teachers of education and the college teachers of subject matter.

This misunderstanding between the two groups of people engaged in the education of teachers has resulted in the failure to realize anything like the full fruits of effective coöperation between the two groups in their common and theoretically joint responsibility of teacher education. Clannishness, emotionalism, and prejudice have characterized the mutual criticisms to an

extent which would be comical, were they not so unworthy of men thought to have acquired the intellectual disciplines of college and graduate study.

The demand for trained teachers in elementary schools gave rise to the development of a new type of institution, the normal school. For the education of high school teachers, on the other hand, the already existing institutions, the colleges and the universities, were employed. Little or no adaptation to the objectives of teacher preparation was made in the content, staff, methods, or effective objectives of the subject-matter departments of these institutions. Whether the organization and teaching of the content of such subjects as mathematics, history, and English should be changed for the education of teachers was given no serious thought. In fact, little time was spent in attempts to discover what college courses should contribute most to the effectiveness of teachers in those fields.

The fields of specialization for prospective teachers, majors and minors, were not differentiated on the basis of subject fields taught in secondary schools or upon the teaching load of teachers in the high schools. Rather, prospective teachers "majored" and "minored" according to administrative divisions of the college or university—in economics, physics, botany, political science, etc. Far more often than not, the courses prescribed as constituting a major were determined with little reference to the objectives of teacher preparation.

In earlier days, when colleges and universities were small, conditions were better. As college enrollments increased and the amount of knowledge suitable as course of study materials expanded, college faculties also grew in number and became more specialized. Departments broke up into segments and the fields of specialization of teachers became decidedly more narrow. Because higher institutions did not offer a great number of courses, the college graduate in the past was fairly well informed in broad fields of knowledge; today he is ignorant in many important fields, and cannot see the relationship between his narrow specialty and other forms of human thought and activity.

Meanwhile professorships, departments, and schools and colleges of education were established and grew in number. For reasons upon which it is impossible to obtain agreement between professors of education and their academic cousins, the departments of education sought, and obtained to considerable degree, administrative autonomy. The two major groups responsible for the education of teachers became further and further separated and alienated. The professors of education delegated to themselves the responsibility for the education of teachers. The professors of subject matter were primarily interested not in problems of teacher education but in their fields of specialization, and their activities consisted largely in efforts to require prospective teachers to take as much course work as possible in their fields, and in muttering curses upon their pedagogical cousins. Co-

operation under these conditions frequently did not materialize beyond the state of absolute necessity of the ordinary amenities between gentlemen, and sometimes not that far, and with a corresponding superficiality and perfunctoriness. In fact, suspicion and jealousies have been intensified and incredible mutual misunderstanding has developed.

The situation with respect to the relation of subject-matter education to the needs of teachers in the high schools has grown progressively worse. As evidence of this condition, permit me to present here some data from a review which I made for the Committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools on the Subject Matter Preparation of Secondary School Teachers, a review of some seventy of the investigations made of subject-matter education of high school teachers. These data show the extent to which teachers are attempting to succeed in fields in which they are clearly not adequately prepared, and consequently handicapped.

"1. Very few teachers, usually less than 20 per cent, are teaching only the specific major subject for which they prepared in college. Even if the major be considered as a broad field such as science rather than as a subject such as physics, very seldom are there found more than half of the teachers in any one study who are teaching only in their major fields. One must admit, of course, that this situation may be traced in part, though only in part, to special problems of the small high school. (Median enrollment of public high schools in the United States lies between 100 and 105.) In large comprehensive high schools it is obviously a relatively easy matter to assign a teacher to his major subject only. In small schools the number of sections to be taught in the various subject fields are rarely found to be exact multiples of the standard teaching load.

"2. Large numbers of teachers, about 25 per cent, are teaching one or more classes in subjects in which they have neither a major nor a minor. The numbers reported run as high as 46 per cent for some academic subjects. Proportions beyond 20 per cent are quite common.

"3. Teachers of agriculture, home economics, English, general science, music, and French are best prepared in their particular fields; and teachers of physics, manual arts, and commercial subjects least prepared. For example, some studies report medians as high as 74-75 semester-hours (agriculture), others as low as 2.4 semester-hours (commercial) of preparation in college.

"4. In most of the sciences the typical specific preparation of teachers is very meager, physics (with a median of five semester-hours in one study) being the lowest reported. When science as a whole is considered as a major, the amount of preparation appears more adequate, but obviously these figures are not encouraging, since so often the pattern of preparation is

not well adapted to the specific subjects taught. Teachers of physics in New Jersey high schools, for example, had but one and one-half years of training in physics as compared to three years in chemistry.

"5. The limited data available indicate that individual teachers of specific branches of science and the social studies in many cases do not have preparation in related fields. In Iowa, for example, 36 per cent of the teachers of chemistry and 91 per cent of the teachers of physics had no training at all in biology; 26 per cent of the teachers in biology had no training in chemistry; 35 per cent of the teachers of economics and 69 per cent of the teachers of sociology had no training in political science; and 20 per cent of the teachers of economics had no training in sociology. In California, 23 of 94 teachers of biological sciences, 12 of 57 teaching chemistry, and 6 of 23 in physics had not even the equivalent of 12 semester hours training in any science other than their major subject.

"6. There is evidence of need for broader subject-matter preparation in the facts that (a) except in industrial, household, and fine arts and physical education, usually less than 10 per cent of high school teachers are teaching exclusively in the fields of their college majors, whereas (b) usually from 70 to 80 per cent are teaching in one or more fields outside of their college majors."

While those unfortunate conditions may be attributed in part to other influences such as (1) the failure of administrators to select and assign teachers in the light of their preparation, and (2) the impossibility in most schools of assigning to teachers only subjects in which they are prepared—perhaps the greatest single factor is the fact that teachers are required to specialize in terms of segments of field, e.g., economics, chemistry, etc., while their teaching responsibilities are usually in terms of broader fields, e.g., science, social studies, etc. Requiring prospective teachers to complete majors in two or even three of these smaller areas is a misguided attempt to remedy the situation, and may do more harm than good by further reduction of the electives which the teacher may employ to give himself a well-rounded education.

It should be clear that under no plan of administration can the responsibility for teacher education be taken from, or be disavowed by, those who instruct the future teacher in the fields which he or she is to teach. Regardless of how little or how infrequently the faculties of arts colleges may turn their attention to problems of teacher preparation, a large proportion, often a majority, of the students in their classes are prospective teachers. On the basis of the number of students served, perhaps the major function of the typical arts college is that of teacher-education. In other words, it is a teacher-training institution, even though there is a separate School or College of Education. It is one of the great responsibilities of schools and

departments of education to awaken subject-matter departments to their responsibility and to orient them in the problems of teacher education.

The considerations outlined in the foregoing paragraphs constitute the basis upon which the new Division of Teacher Education at the University of North Carolina is projected. They constitute its platform. Their soundness is recognized not only by President Frank Graham but by Dean Hobbs of the Arts College, and the administrative board of the University.

Before we turn to the structure and plan which was established at the University of North Carolina, let us first review quite briefly the story of its origin. In 1932, the Commission of University Consolidation, authorized by the previous legislature of the State of North Carolina, made its report to Governor O. Max Gardner and the Board of Trustees of the University. The Commission was charged with working out a scheme to bring about a unification of the executive control of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, and the College for Women at Greensboro so that those institutions might best serve the state. The report was in reality that of a committee of three educators from other states who had been selected by the commission to make the needed survey and to make recommendations for consolidation. The three men were Dr. George A. Works, Dean of Students of the University of Chicago, chairman; Dr. Frank L. McVey, President of the University of Kentucky; and Dr. Guy Stanton Ford, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota.

The committee employed as consultants in the field of teacher education Dean Charles H. Judd and Professor W. S. Gray of the School of Education at the University of Chicago. It was in the recommendations of the committee based upon the report of Dr. Judd and Dr. Gray that the idea of combining the faculties and other resources of the School of Education and the College of Liberal Arts had its origin at North Carolina.

Principal among their recommendations were the following:

1. The School of Education should be reorganized as a part of the College of Liberal Arts.

2. Instructors giving special methods courses should be appointed jointly by the department of education and the subject-matter department concerned.

With respect to these proposed changes the survey staff reported that:

1. The Dean of the School of Education opposed this change for the following reasons:

   a. The rigid language and mathematics requirements in the Arts College,
   b. The extreme specialization in the college, and
   c. The unsympathetic attitude of the college faculty toward professional courses.

2. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts believed the proposed reorganization to be practical and desirable provided that prospective teachers be registered through his office and that they be assigned to a special adviser from the department of education because:

a. Members of academic departments are not familiar with the professional requirements and would not want to be made responsible for administration of them,

b. Modifications would be necessary in the usual requirements of the college which could be administered to the student's best interest by someone professionally concerned.

It is my belief and that of President Graham and prominent members of his staff that the sympathetic and intelligent coöperation of the entire faculty of the College of Liberal Arts may be most effectively brought about by a close working relationship. It seems logical that the people in education and those in subject-matter departments will learn from each other and that they will reach a mutual understanding with respect to the divergent viewpoints of the two departments. The very fact of having to work together will bring contacts which will provide opportunities for exchange of views and information.

Perhaps under more unfortunate conditions, contacts would result only in friction and increased mistrust. Perhaps under some less courageous and idealistic administrative heads, the venture would be undertaken at great risk; but those who know President Frank Graham well know how secure we may feel in his willingness to support what is sound educationally, regardless of what principles of opportunism or "diplomacy" might suggest.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is peculiarly well suited to try out the plan. All of the subject-matter instruction is given in the arts college. It does not prepare teachers of home economics, industrial arts, agriculture, or commercial subjects. The members of the department of education sit in the faculties of each of the three divisions of the arts college—(1) social studies, (2) science, and (3) humanities. One cannot escape the fact that in such an institution the arts college is the teacher-training unit. We in education hope to lead from the inside in a way that we had never been able to lead from the outside. We have been asked to come in and lead. We have accepted the invitation. We do not expect immediate revolutionary results. We do expect to reorient the faculty of the arts college to the problems of teacher education. We do expect to interest them in the responsibility and problems of teacher education. We expect also to learn much from them. We hope to eliminate most of the antagonism and misunderstanding that has characterized the relations between the department of education and the subject-matter departments. The most notable weaknesses in the education of teachers today are in (1) inadequate

subject-matter preparation to lead in curriculum reorganization, and in (2) understanding the world for which they are preparing young people. We hope to get at the heart of this phase of teacher education better by being organically a part of the subject-matter unit of the University.

At any rate, it is an experiment that needs to be undertaken under reasonably favorable circumstances. Under the "divorced" plan of organization we have made progress very slowly. It seems reasonable that at least in certain types of institutions we can do better by a coöperative attack of subject-matter and education departments on the problem, which is brought about by a more complete understanding of the problems of teacher education by all of those engaged in it. The experimentation should be done by those who believe in the possibilities of the experimental plan, and I am challenged by its opportunities. If we fail to make it work, I shall be among the first to concede its failure.

The Individual Goes to College*

By H. E. Hawkes
Dean, Columbia University

In the remarks that I wish to make this morning I do not propose to talk about new education theories. No "New Plan" will be advocated with the implication that those who have previously sat in the darkness have now for the first time the privilege of seeing a great light. I have no social reform to advance. Such efforts are interesting, often suggestive of debate, and provocative of discussion. My program is far more modest. I would like to discuss briefly certain assumptions on which some of us are basing the administration of the colleges with which we are associated, and to present a bare outline of some of the implications of these assumptions. I am forced to say at the start that I really do not know whether the philosophy came first and the techniques followed, or whether the philosophy is the rationalization of a method that commended itself.

Dean Woodbridge once expressed the point of departure of what I have to say in an aphorism which has always stayed by me. "We must start from where we are, and work with what we've got." Well, where are we in this educational enterprise? What have we got to work with? And how are we going to proceed? I suppose that we would all agree that we need not expect any miracles to be performed. Boys and girls will continue to be boys and girls. Nor do we desire too violent discontinuities in the progress either of the boy or of the college from one level to the next. We all need a jolt once in awhile, but the ideal is a fairly continuous advance.

In this country and at this time we are looking at our problem of education, theoretically at least, from a point of view diametrically opposed to that of many earlier peoples. The students of primitive culture tell me that the societal unit in most of these cultures is not the individual, but the family, or in many cases the tribe. To be sure, there was a head man, a chief; but he merely symbolized the group. In the Far East today the family is the basic unit of society. If a man commits some misdemeanor which merits punishment, it is not necessary that he should be punished personally; any one in the family will do just as well. If he performs some act of distinction, it is no credit to him; the family is honored. Even in our own country, in the earlier days of family feuds, if you were in the family opposed to mine and I had a chance to shoot you, I would do it—regardless of whether you as an individual had ever offended me as an individual. The unit in terms of which everything was done was the family. At present

* An address delivered before the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, April 1, 1938.

in Germany and Italy the individual seems to be nothing; but the larger group, in these cases the State, is everything. In fact, all over the world, except in the English speaking countries and in a few others, the sinking of the individual and the elevation of the importance of the larger group as the important unit seems to be the order of the day. Nowhere and at no time has the individual been accepted as the basic societal unit to the extent that we in this country are attempting in our educational structure. We sometimes like to think that this idea lies at the foundation of our national life.

A moment's reflection must convince one that when an attitude which runs contrary to the age-long and world-wide tendencies is adopted, there is plenty of difficulty in the offing. The course cannot be plain sailing. The mores and the entire organization of the social and political structure afford resistance to such an attitude. Almost, if not quite, the only great movement that has lasted through any considerable length of time which is on the side of the individual as of supreme importance is the Christian religion. In that religion it has been the individual who has sought and has found salvation; it is the individual, not the group, that finds consolation and support in the Christian faith. Perhaps the tendency in the world is largely anti-Christian. The attitude of the rulers of Germany at the present time toward the Christian religion is certainly consistent with this statement. Those in power will tolerate nothing which dignifies the individual. Hence their attitude toward the Christian Church is perfectly logical, but perfectly destructive of what to us makes life worthwhile.

If all of this is true, and if we accept the training of the individual as the supreme responsibility of our schools and colleges, it is well to realize at the start that we are traveling an untrodden path; that we must watch our step; and that we may make many errors in carrying out so novel an enterprise. This means that we must have courage to try new methods, and that we must be very tolerant of those who make the inevitable errors of pioneers. Charles Beard once remarked that when dealing with a living and growing organization, the reactionary who wishes to change nothing is certain to be wrong. The fact of being alive means change. The person who wants to change everything is also almost certain to be wrong too, but there is just a slight chance that he may in some particular be right; just a wee chance. And it is this little chance of success that makes the work of the progressive interesting and worthwhile.

What are the implications of this policy of educating the individual that are of importance to us in our everyday job of teaching and administration? Well, in the first place the individual boy is not cut up into separate sections by the various levels of any school system. He is the same boy in the grades that he is in the high school, and it is the very same boy that goes on to college. If this is true, the only intelligent attitude toward the problem is to

recognize the obvious fact, and treat him accordingly. This means the establishment of the closest possible relation with him at every stage in order to obtain an understanding of the mind, the body, and the temperament of the boy; and the organization of channels of communication for passing this understanding on as he proceeds from grade to grade. It means a flexibility in administering the regulations for entering college which takes into account all these characteristics of the individual. It also means flexibility in the administration of the college which makes it unlikely that a boy's education may be ruined by required conformity to rules not adapted to the kind of person that he is.

The statements just made may be too general to mean very much, except that I am trying to advocate a policy of substituting knowledge of the individual and intelligence in dealing with him for inflexible rules and regulations.

One further remark of somewhat general character must precede any getting down to details of actual procedure. One of the most significant discoveries which has been developed during the past twenty five years has centered around so-called individual differences. In some schools this idea has been treated as if it constituted the only fact that we needed to consider in our treatment of the student. In some places the emphasis on individual differences has been carried to an absurd degree. When taken as the only principle in education it means that a fresh and new curriculum, practically a private college, must be set up for each boy. Of course this is silly. The fact of the matter is that important as individual differences may be, and important as it is to discover them for each boy, individual similarities are even more important. To overemphasize individual differences for a boy tends to set him apart, to increase his sense of his own importance; in short to make him a non-social person. Any school or college that emphasizes individual differences to the exclusion of individual similarities is certainly running contrary to the welfare of most boys.

The foregoing remarks indicate that in my opinion we are committed to the policy of aiming our educational work primarily at the individual as the basic unit in our society; that knowledge of the individual during the entire span of his life and over the entire extent of his make-up, environment, and performance is necessary as background for a satisfactory job; that we must have a form of administration and instruction sufficiently basic to take care of the common elements in the make-up of our students, and sufficiently flexible to take care of individual differences. This is where we start.

With what do we have to work? In most cases with boys and girls who have fair ability, the usual immaturity, good intentions, perhaps fewer social, moral, and even intellectual inhibitions than the youth of a decade or so ago, more serious apprehension as to just where they are going

to fit in the somewhat messy world of the present, less tendency to take things on authority but possessing more willingness than their fathers to be shown. These are a few of the impressions that present-day youth leave on me. This is the human material with which we have to work.

In commenting on some of the techniques by which we may proceed from where we are, let me confine myself to the college level, for the reason that this is where my own experience lies.

Let us first speak briefly about the curriculum. If we are to begin with each student at the place where he is, we must have some means of finding out for each one where that point is. Everyone knows that two boys who present identical units or credits for admission in French, for example, may be far apart in actual proficiency. Well, since this is so, it is necessary to give entering students an opportunity to show what they can do in terms of the kind of work that the student will continue in college. It requires some little experimentation to find a test of sufficient range and accuracy to indicate exactly what course each student ought to enter. It is inevitable that some will be promoted above their expectation, and others will be demoted. In my experience those who are promoted beyond the point that their admission record would indicate are stimulated to justify the confidence placed in them, and those who are demoted make every effort to show that the demotion was unmerited. Anyhow, by a careful administration of this idea each boy finds his level for effective work with reasonable accuracy.

After the boy is actually in college, and finds his level, he meets the prescriptions for the degree. I know that I am treading on dangerous ground when I suggest that the requirements for the degree in a given college may not be inspired from On High. There are four or five hundred colleges in the United States conferring the A.B. degree on the satisfactory completion of the local requirements, and I venture that no two of them are exactly alike. Now, it does not stand to reason that they are all sacred. In fact I do not believe that any of them are sacred. The only sacred element is the personality of the student, and the responsibility for his best individual development. Assuming that the admissions people have not made a mistake in admitting the boy to college, the college has assumed a solemn responsibility to do its level best to give him the opportunity to rise to his highest level—intellectually and spiritually. If, after knowing the boy, it becomes clear that prescribed courses stand in the way of his reaching this level, I ask you as reasonable beings, what ought to give way? But please do not overlook the "if" clause in this statement. "If, after knowing the boy"—that is the major premise of the whole procedure. I have had considerable experience with this technique, and I assure you that when carefully administered it raises, rather than lowers, standards of scholarly accomplishment. The procedure just described takes care of a considerable

part of the need for adapting the curriculum to the individual differences between students.

With individual differences taken care of, how about the backbone of the curriculum? How about the individual similarities? Well, we each have our own way of taking care of the courses that we think should normally be prescribed for the degree. Some of us feel that the good old English philosophy is the soundest one to follow; namely, that the person should devote himself almost entirely to one narrow subject, on the theory that if he goes far toward the bottom of one subject he is competent to do the same for any other subject that he may meet. This may be called the diamond drill plan. Going down deep in a straight line, without knowing anything as to what may be at any moment only a few inches from one. One must not forget that it is very dark down in that narrow hole, and however excellent a method it may be for finding something whose location is known, quite different types of procedure are required for different types of investigation.

Another method is the provision of prescribed courses, taken usually in the earlier years of college, broad in extent, more comparable to open surface excavation than to the diamond drill. One does not go as deep, but covers more ground, and sees what one is doing all of the time. Personally I do not like the term "survey" courses. Such courses should not be devoted to looking at a subject. They are not Cook Tours. Broad prescribed courses at their best are much more than surveys. They ought to help the student to locate an intellectual interest which the diamond drill kind of course cannot do. And they should furnish a sound and solid foundation on which the more concentrated work of the later years of college may rest. Such courses, which often require close interdepartmental coöperation, depend absolutely for their success on the staff of teachers that happen to be present in a given institution. It is utterly futile to try to introduce such an enterprise by administrative order. I am inclined to think that the larger the institution, and consequently the more diverse the teaching staff in professional interests, the more likely one would be able to present this kind of curriculum with success. One fact, however, does stand out with respect to this sort of offering. It is very unlikely that such a course can be taken over *in toto* from one institution to another without adapting it to the necessities of the student, the tradition, and the staff of its new home. The idea, and perhaps a little of the material, is transferable, but the finished product has usually not proved to be capable of transplantation.

Along with the procedures described it is certainly desirable to afford some opportunity for the boy who wishes to make more rapid progress than his fellows—and to do so in an orderly manner. Many colleges find that so-called achievement examinations on the basis of which a student may pass

off some prescribed or prerequisite course are almost a necessity. At some institutions these achievement tests reduce the residence requirement for the degree. In others not. If one takes the position that the intellectual is the only side of the individual that college is concerned with, then it follows that the passing of these tests should be credited toward the degree; thus making it possible for a man to be lifted out of the street, given a battery of examinations, and enrolled among the graduates of the college. To my way of thinking, this reduces the college to an examining bureau. We certainly need examining bureaus, but I think colleges have a wider function. If, on the other hand, one accepts the theory that college is interested in other than the intellectual, for example in the social and ethical education of boys, then the process of going through college with abundant opportunity for contacts with fellow students and faculty is a part and an important part of the education of youth. It may be that we need institutions having both approaches toward the problem.

So much for the curriculum. Let us now take a hasty glance at other features of the college. Recall that the major premise underlying everything that has been said is the assumption that the individual student occupies the center of gravity of collegiate education. And if this is true, we are not doing our job unless we make it our business first, last, and all the time to know him. Let me here, in passing, express a word of admiration and commendation of the work that has been carried on in recent years by the Commission on Coördination in this State, whose work is so widely and favorably known.

There are one or two weak spots in most of our colleges which make this ambition difficult to attain. For example, the necessity of carrying forward with the student all of the information about him that is picked up at the various levels is obvious. I know that in many colleges the material obtained by the admissions officer stays in his office; the result of the student's acquaintance with his freshman adviser and instructors remains in their files, or more likely in their memories; and so it goes all the way through college. In vain one appeals to the other person for any systematic help in this important work of procuring and passing on significant material.

The real difficulty which is in the way of progress I think we all recognize. We are all so busy with the routine duties of our jobs that this somewhat casual responsibility for sending on notes about all the boys that we know simply gets by us. But it ought not to. The idea back of the cumulative record is absolutely fundamental for the kind of education to which we are committed. To neglect this matter is to give the lie to our conviction that the individual is the center of our system.

There are certainly some dangers in the path of progress in this direction. For example, it is possible to place too great reliance on the results of a few tests. No single examination or test tells all that one ought to know about

a boy. If any one test is taken as telling the whole truth, serious error is certain to result. Only by eternal vigilance and acquaintanceship through all possible mediums can we expect to know these youngsters well enough to place before them the opportunity appropriate for them. On the other hand it is equally futile to give more tests than one is equipped to use. Tests, the results of which go into the files and stay there, do no good at all. Unless they are used as contributing something to our knowledge of the individual and assist in the personnel work of the college, they miss their principal usefulness.

One further point of absolutely fundamental importance must be mentioned. We who are trying to hold administrative positions in colleges are dealing with individual members of the teaching staff as well as with individual students. It cannot be denied that a substantial number of the members of the staff are not the kind of persons who can enter into this highly personal aspect of the relation between the boy and his college. They are more interested in some research or study in their own field which seems to them of greater importance than "fooling around" teaching boys. And they are right so far as their own activities are concerned. Not every one can contribute to the knowledge of boys any more than every one can contribute to the knowledge of Sanskrit. We need both kinds and each must be made to realize that his contribution is essential to the operation of an effective college. In my experience not more than ten or twenty per cent of any college faculty is qualified by temperament and interest to perform this personnel service. If others are asked to do it, it will be shirked, or not well done. Now the point is that book scholarship has traditionally been the only asset of the college teacher that is worth paying him any salary for. If the man who is highly competent to contribute to this individual work is made to feel, as the attempt was made to make me feel in my earlier days, that every moment of time that I spent thinking or caring for students outside the classroom was time wasted, it is impossible to build up the attitude that I have been talking about on any solid basis. Unless the young college instructor can feel that distinguished work with students is rewarded by salary and promotion, as certainly as distinguished scholarship, the whole enterprise rests on loyalty alone. We all know that an enterprise in our colleges can be floated on loyalty for a certain length of time, but sooner or later it must be taken care of in the budget if it is to be permanent.

I admit that there is difficulty in recognizing distinguished personnel work. But I do not think the limit of error is any greater in this evaluation than one encounters in counting up the pages of publication on subjects that one does not understand for the alleged scholar who is a candidate for promotion.

There are some who do not agree with the thesis which has been developed

in the foregoing remarks. Some contend that the only function of college is to train the mind. As I have often expressed it, the part north of the neck is the only part that they would admit to college. I do not believe that we ought to try to dismember the boy when he is admitted to college, but to take him as he is, and if he is deemed worthy to enter, do our level best to give him the kind of training that will make him a well-rounded person. The picture of a school room with forty little minds at forty little desks, is purely imaginary. We have, to be sure, forty little minds, all different; but also forty little bodies full of pep, forty backgrounds, forty ambitions, forty temperaments—all combining to present to the intelligent teacher a problem vastly more complex than merely forty little minds alone would provide. I know of no surgical operation that dissects out the minds and lays them bare and naked before the teacher.

Then there are others who feel that the function of the college is to embark on a program of social reform in the effort to make over the world. Heaven knows that the world needs a lot of tinkering if not entire reorganization, but I do not think that the college should take this as its immediate and direct ambition. Some believe that the primary duty of the college is to make the world fit for men. I believe that the main job of the college is to make men fit for the world. If we are successful in performing this service of building up able men and women who are competent in mind, vigorous in body, tolerant in attitude, courageous in spirit, and coöperative in temperament, we shall have reason to say our *nunc dimmittis* with composure.

Some Problems of Catholic Secondary Education*

By P. A. Roy, S.J.
Dean, Loyola University

The courtesy extended to me in inviting me to discuss with you some problems of Catholic education manifests this Commission's characteristic spirit of broadmindedness and of hearty coöperation. During the years that I enjoyed membership in your Commission, serving on the Louisiana Committee, I always found the members of the Commission trying to appreciate fully the varied aims and policies of member schools, ever eager to help schools in the solutions of problems, and constantly striving in a reasonable way to improve the status of secondary education in the South. Your Commission is doing a great work.

To discuss properly with you some of the problems of Catholic secondary education, I think it well to give you first a very brief statement of the basic principles of the Catholic philosophy of education. We cannot understand completely the problems of any system of education unless we know the philosophical foundation upon which the system is reared. For the most part we live as we think. When we do not, usually we are prevented by compelling circumstances over which we have no control. Catholic education aims at training students to live as they know they should live. The Catholic philosophy of education is the outgrowth of the Catholic philosophy of life into which its roots are deeply sunk and from which it draws its vitality. The function of Catholic education is to teach students not merely how to be successful in this life, but especially how to be successful in eternity by a right use of the opportunities of the present life. We educate for time and eternity, because students must be prepared for both.

We believe not only in the existence of God, but also in His supreme authority over all persons. It is our conviction that all are responsible to Him for the manner in which they live. If they live in a manner pleasing to Him, they will enjoy eternal happiness, the goal of every life. We must teach our students how to win that. Consequently, thorough instruction in man's relations to God is a part of all Catholic education. In our secondary schools the students are given practical methods of meeting life situations properly. They are instructed in the moral responsibilities involved in their rights and duties as individuals and as members of the social order, in the inviolability of the rights of others. They are taught respect for divine and civil authority, and obedience to both. We recognize that every student is a composite being consisting of body and soul. The body

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 29, 1938.

is the functional medium of sense perceptions and sense appetites, the soul the functional medium of the faculties of intellect and will. The rationality of the soul alone differentiates man from animals. Hence it is the governing element in man. Quite naturally, then, our education is directed at perfecting primarily the functional faculties of the soul, secondarily, but quite necessarily, the functional powers of the body. Our greatest concern is not what students will study, but how by their studies they may develop and aid their intellects in the search for and the recognition of truth, and how they may strengthen their wills, so that in all circumstances of life they will embrace what is right and good and reject what is wrong or evil. Our prime objective in education is to teach the students to think correctly and to choose rightly, because these are the two determining elements of real success in life and of good citizenship.

As every student is essentially a social entity, he must be taught how properly to enjoy his privileges and how becomingly to fulfill his obligations in the social order. He is to be brought to realize what are his duties to his family, to his fellow-men, to his city and state, to his country. He must become convinced that he is under serious moral obligations to perform those duties. We realize that certain types of curricula are of greater value than others towards obtaining these objectives, But we maintain that no curriculum will be worth a student's time, if it does not train him to reason logically, to work accurately to the discovery of truth, to be able to recognize what is right and what is wrong; and if it does not strengthen his will so that he shall choose correctly according to sound moral standards.

These are the fundamental principles of the Catholic philosophy of education. Let us now discuss some of our problems.

The educational methods and the curricula of Catholic schools very frequently are branded as traditional in the worst pedagogic acceptation of that term. This is a polite way of saying that our curricula are antiquated and our methods smack of medievalism. In the opinion of our censurers our system of education is so antique that it would creak and crash under the stress of modern, high-pressure, functional education. That our philosophy of education is ancient, we admit. We are proud of that. It reaches back through many, many centuries. Historians write of certain "ages" when the torch of Catholic education was the only light of learning to illumine the world which was groping its way through intellectual darkness. That our methods of education and our curricula are antiquated, we deny. What is antiquated is superannuated, outmoded, useless. The records of the products of Catholic education show that we are far from giving useless instruction.

But our problem is this: Why should any schools be considered antiquated simply because those who conduct them are not constantly changing curricula and methods of instruction? Shall only those schools be consid-

ered up-to-date and efficient which, by constant changes, have become educational chameleons? Has it ever been demonstrated that the necessary characteristic of every superior or even of every average school is a continual shifting of curriculum and methods to comply with each new idea that someone gets about the essentials of proper education? After all, I do not believe that the forefathers of most of us were ignoramuses; neither are we. Yet I doubt that most of us got our high school certificates or diplomas by becoming intellectual acrobats skilled in performing on swinging educational trapezes.

Certainly some change in curricula is occasionally required to meet the varying demands of progressive civilization. No worthwhile program of study remains static. It is developed to meet the needs of the pupils of the day. Modification of instructional methods are called for when present methods are proved to be inferior. Our students are entitled to the best possible instruction. Our Catholic schools have changed, are changing, and shall continue to change both in curricula and methods. But we do not see that our prime concern should be what the students study. Rather it should be what those students get out of what they study.

Some very zealous promoters of vocational education are all a-twitter with eagerness to have all types of courses in skills offered to high school students. They insist that these students should specialize in preparation for life work. They would have us train future carpenters, electricians, bricklayers, painters, bookkeepers, stenographers, dressmakers, and whatnot. That some such training is highly desirable for certain types of pupils is beyond question. But two questions keep bothering me. How many pupils who enter high school with their minds made up that after graduation they will follow a definite life pursuit actually follow that pursuit through life? Again, of what avail will such a highly specialized training be to those students who, after graduation, find that because of unforeseen circumstances they cannot make a living in the field of work for which they have been prepared with such exclusive specialization? How will they earn a decent living? I believe that it is better to devote the high school years to training the intellects of students to think correctly, to reason logically, to work out mental problems for themselves. When they have graduated, they will have brains enough to make a decent living in whatever pursuit they choose. They will have to be trained in any business they take up, but they will get more out of that training than will others who have not had this type of education. Business men have told me, time and again, that they would rather get a young man with a sharp mind who knows nothing about business, and train him to conduct their business as they want it conducted, than to get one who has had highly specialized business training without a keen development of intellect. Intelligence gets results.

While we Catholic educators are not traditional in the new and condemn-

ing sense of the word, we are conservative in policy. Between these two attitudes there is a vast difference. We are not wedded to any curriculum or to any method of instruction, but we do adhere to sound principles and to policies that have proven to be efficient. Behind us are hundreds of years of carefully studied experience in teaching all classes of people in every country in the world. Few, if any, other systems of education in our country have had that grand opportunity for very careful pedagogic research through so many centuries in such a vast and variedly equipped human laboratory. Would we not be guilty of inexcusable folly were we to throw aside as worthless all the discoveries and experiences that have come to us from those centuries of research? The twentieth century has not a monopoly in the discovery of efficient methods of teaching. No century has had it. Histories of education tell us that the past has produced many new methods that were worthless, very few that were efficient. History is repeating itself today. The conservative school always studies with interest the ever-changing experiments of the precipitate school. If it finds a new method more effective, characteristically it will drop the old method and adopt the new. But it is slow to reject an efficient method for one of doubtful worth. Students of today are our nation's destiny for tomorrow. As sacred trusts they are committed to our care to be taught to think correctly and to choose rightly so that in their turn they will be able to promote and protect our country's welfare. They have only a few years of their lives to give to education. What the rest of their lives will be usually depends upon what they get in school. During their few years of study under our guidance, we have a solemn obligation to them, to our country, and to ourselves to see that they are really educated. We have no right to use them as pedagogical guinea pigs for experimenting in every new method of education devised by some professor who has forgotten his obligation to youth in his mad desire for research. How shall we vindicate our sense of duty to students when we have graduated a group who were supposed to get an education, but who instead were made the subjects of an experiment which later we ourselves admit was an utter failure? We, of the conservative schools, "are not the first by whom the new are tried, nor yet the last to lay the old aside." If this be traditionalism, I believe that we shall remain traditionalists. We call it conservatism, and we are convinced that it is a very sound educational policy.

Another problem which we face is the charge frequently made that there is practically no academic freedom in Catholic schools. If academic freedom means that any faculty member may teach the students whatever he chooses to think as true, regardless of how contrary it may be to objective truth, that he may teach as certain what is only probable, and fail students because they do not say with him that it is certain, that he may teach as something moral what to us is immoral, then we admit the charge that there

is no academic freedom in Catholic schools; and we do not intend to do anything about it. But we deny that that is academic freedom. It is academic license, and has no place in any school. License never leads to truth. Truth is the goal of education.

There is such a thing as objective truth. Everyone of us implicitly admits this in nearly all the actions of our lives. It is objectively true that we live. It is objectively true that we see and hear and feel and speak. It is objectively true that we are eating when we eat. It is objectively true that we are living in the United States. There are millions and millions of objective truths. We are supposed to teach truth to our students, and anyone who makes use of his teaching position to contravene truth is not enjoying academic freedom, but is indulging in academic license. What is true must be presented as true; what is probable, as only probable; the doubtful, as doubtful; a theory, as a theory; what is false, as false. Any other procedure is not education, but misguidance. Our civilization will never progress, our country never prosper under the direction of men and women who have been misguided from youth.

Unbelievable as it may be to some, nevertheless it is true that real academic freedom, not license, flourishes as much in Catholic systems of education as it does in any other systems. When there are various opinions on any subject, our teachers are perfectly free to present them for the students' study; but they are supposed to present them fairly, that the students may study them squarely. Anything else would be misguidance. It is true that our schools require that some few attitudes and beliefs be developed intellectually in our students, though the contrary attitudes and beliefs are presented and studied. Naturally, we teach the Catholic religion to Catholics. We teach our students to cherish and defend democracy, because our country is definitely committed to democracy. Yet other forms of government are studied and analyzed. If such restrictions placed on our teachers be a violation of academic freedom, then practically every school in our country violates that freedom. What church-related school would permit its faculty to teach the students that they should follow a religion contrary to the religion of the church to which the school is related? What public school would permit its faculty to teach the students to decry and impugn the policies and politics of the majority of the legislature and the constituency that supply the funds for that school? What school in the South would permit the faculty to teach that Negroes should enjoy the privileges of social equality and of social amalgamation with the most highly respected of our own race? What American school, worthy of the title of American, would permit the students to be taught that they should defy all parental and civil authority, that they should refuse to be educated, that they should overthrow our democracy and force all of us to accept fascism or communism or anarchy? If it is a violation of academic freedom to require that our

faculties refrain from such teaching, then academic freedom is destructive of the best interests of our country. I do not believe that such restrictions are a violation of academic freedom.

The charge of indoctrination in Catholic schools presents another problem. If we accept the definition of indoctrination given by dictionaries, we hardly have reason to maintain that indoctrination mars the educational worth of a school. To indoctrinate, according to the dictionaries, is to instruct in the rudiments or principles of learning, or of a branch of learning; to instruct in or imbue with principles or doctrines. If this be an evil thing to do, all worthwhile schools and all well-reared families are guilty of that evil. Are not schools supposed to instruct students in the principles of arithmetic, algebra, geometry; in the principles of correct speaking and writing of English and of any other language studied; in the principles of botany, zoölogy, physics, chemistry; in the principles of art and music, shop, and physical education? Are we not supposed to imbue our students with the doctrine of democracy for our democratic country, with the doctrine of respect for authority properly constituted and rightly exercised, with the doctrine of self-reliance and self-support, with the doctrine of due regard for the rights of their fellow-men; with the doctrine, in short, of good citizenship? Do not the parents of every well-reared family instruct their children in the principles of good table manners, in the principles of personal and household health and sanitation, in the principles of correct behavior in public? Do they not imbue their children with the doctrines of that private and social life which befits their social status? Would the children be allowed to take over the management of the home and dictate what their parents shall and shall not do? Why should such a type of indoctrination in Catholic schools constitute a serious educational problem, when all well regulated schools, families, businesses, even, to a large extent, our own country, realize its necessity or helpfulness?

If the so-called stigma of indoctrination implies that the Catholic schools are guilty of an educational evil in instructing their Catholic students in the principles of the Catholic religion and imbuing them with its doctrines, then that stigma is properly branded upon us. But we deny that it can rightly be considered a stigma. We deny that it is an intellectual or a social evil. Our graduates' records of good citizenship, patriotic service, and leadership in professional and commercial life, extending back in this country many years before the American Revolution, prove that our schools have not marred their educational efficiency by including in their curricula the teaching of the Catholic religion to Catholic students.

But if indoctrination means that there can be no initiative on the part of the students, no personal activity leading to self-development and to a mastery of environment, no mental and moral self-discipline to strengthen personal character and to develop the qualities of good citizenship; if it

means that the pupil is to be an intellectually spoon-fed infant passively receiving whatever is ladled into his brain and unconcernedly letting it do to his brain whatever good or harm it may; if it excludes all possibility of students thinking for themselves, of their studying problems and reaching conclusions on their initiative; if it means that a school must be an educational factory turning out identical intellectual products regardless of the basically physical, intellectual, moral, economic, and social characteristics which differentiate the individual students; I do not understand how a principal or a teacher with even an iota of common sense could be so ignorant of the evident aims and purposes of education as ever to think of endorsing such a policy of indoctrination. I fear that there are some people whom I do not understand both in Catholic schools and in other schools. Yet we must not condemn any system of education because by some mischance a few misfits are employed in it. Every educational system has its inferior schools, its average schools, its superior schools, its poor teachers, its average teachers, its excellent teachers. Surely we shall judge a system correctly by its average characteristics. The average Catholic school in my judgment would never subscribe to a policy of indoctrination such as we have last considered.

I would say, then, that Catholic schools in general consider the teaching of man's duties and responsibilities to God an essential part of education; that the average Catholic school stresses cultural values in education, without neglecting practical values. We hold that it is of prime importance to teach students how to think. Since certain truths have been determined and others have not, we try to train students to reason rightly to the determined truths, and to reason as best they may to a fair-minded opinion about undetermined questions. As each student differs from others physically, mentally, often also in social and economic environments, we believe that a student must be active in his own mental, moral, social, and physical development. We recognize that our curricula must provide for such development so that students may acquire proper appreciations, attitudes and ideals. Consequently, we believe that curricula and instructional methods must be varied occasionally to meet the changing needs of our pupils.

In conclusion, permit me to state that I very deeply appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you some of our problems. In all my associations with your Commission, I have found it eminently reasonable, fair-minded, understanding, encouraging, and helpful. I repeat that you are doing a great work to raise the status of Southern secondary education. You have been very good in giving me today so much of your time.

I Am a Debtor*

By Spencer McCallie
Headmaster, The McCallie School, Chattanooga, Tennessee

In Romans, first chapter, commencing with verse fourteen, Paul, the brilliant apostle to the Gentiles, cries out: "I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also."

If we had no other statement from Paul or about Paul than these few words, we could estimate accurately his character and personality. These terse words of Paul are indicative of his education and of his philosophy of life. Paul was a man of the finest and highest education—a citizen of Tarsus, no mean city. In addition to the cultural education secured at the University of Tarsus, Paul had taken a post-graduate course at Jerusalem under Gamaliel, the most distinguished and erudite rabbi of his day and generation. Only a man of education and of a deep religious training could so exclaim as Paul did, "I am a debtor!"

May I amplify Paul's expression and at the same time draw out the evident meaning of his statement? Paul clearly understood that he owed a debt of eternal gratitude to the Greeks for their learning, their culture, their literature, their art, and above all for their joyous concept of life. If all contributions to civilization furnished by the Hellenic World could be subtracted, how drab and colorless life would be! If Homer, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripedes, Aristophanes, not to mention a myriad of lesser luminaries, had never been, I doubt very much indeed if there had been a Virgil, a Dante, a Shakespeare, a Racine, a Milton, a Moliere, and a Goethe. Paul's knowledge of Greek literature was profound and extensive, and he knew as only a deeply educated man can know his debt to the Greek. Time is lacking even to enumerate the debt that Paul, you, and I owe to the Greek in other fields of learning. At the base of all learning, whether it be art, literature, or science, we find Hellenic and Hellenistic contributions at once the beginning and the highest expression of perfection in form and taste. No wonder Paul exclaimed, "I am a debtor to the Greeks!"

Paul's breadth of education did not allow him to overlook that he was also a debtor to the barbarian. Too often we fail to recognize our debt to those people and to those countries that lie far outside our group and our political setup. The Roman Empire of Paul's day drew upon countries far beyond the Empire's boundaries for tin, spices, silks, timber, perfumes,

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 29, 1938.

and other materials not to be secured within the borders of the Empire—far flung as they were. Then, as now, no country, no peoples could be self-sufficient and at the same time civilized. Paul truly knew that he owed a debt to the barbarian as well as to the Greek. Paul's debt, even as yours and mine is, was to the wise and to the unwise—to the lawgiver, the engineer, the scientist, and the philosopher, as well as to the day laborer and to the artisan of every type and from every country.

To bring the discussion nearer home, some of my own experiences are not irrelevant and out of place. A little over two years ago, I awoke one morning with an intense abdominal pain; as my custom is when in pain, I ate nothing all that day in hope that the pain would cease. When night approached the pain increased, so I called for the doctor. His diagnosis was speedy and dogmatic: "You have appendicitis and in less than two hours you will be on the operating table." He then went on his way rejoicing and calmly ate a big supper; while I—well, whatever I did, it was not eating!

I'll tell you what I did. I turned over in the bed and offered up to my Heavenly Father a prayer of thanksgiving for Louis Pasteur, Sir Joseph Lister, Florence Nightingale, and especially for Dr. Crawford W. Long, the discoverer of the use of ether as an anaesthetic. I had full assurance that my operation would be painless and free from germs. I knew I would be nursed by a skilled and competent nurse. If Paul had had my trouble, he would have died of acute indigestion or cramp colic, or whatever else the doctors of yesterday named it. In any event, he would have died. While I—well, I did not die; I did not even suffer.

I have had a worse experience in the dentist's chair. It gave me the chance to read *Anthony Adverse* from cover to cover—something no well man would ever do. It would be easy for me to amplify my illustrations by naming thousands of inventions, conveniences, etc., that make life of today what it is. But let one more instance suffice.

These glasses that I wear cost me less than $25.00; but without them, I cannot read. Without them, I cannot fully participate in modern civilization. I am under a deep and everlasting debt of gratitude to a Dutch scientist whose very name I have forgotten. Yet Paul could not have secured glasses though he were possessed of untold wealth. I too am a debtor!

When we hear someone assert: "I am a self-made man, I owe the world nothing, I pay my own way," we know that we are listening to an ignorant, stupid, egocentric moron. I did not, and I could not, pay Lister, Pasteur, and Long. I cannot pay the Dutch scientist for his work in making these glasses of mine possible. It is true I pay the fixed charges for my electricity, my telephone, etc., but I can never repay the inventors and discoverers long since dead that have made this modern world of ours. The self-made moron, as well as you and I, is a debtor both to the wise and to the unwise.

Much of our industrial unrest of today is the direct outcome of the failure of both capital and labor to recognize that both sides are debtors to the social structure that owes its base and even its main outlines to past generations. Benjamin Franklin lives and works today in a far more vital sense than do scores of living capitalists and laborers. Right now in my own city the Southern Ferro-Alloys Company employs over 100,000 men in terms of electrical energy, but employs comparatively few human beings.

The social implications of Paul's statement are clear and unequivocal. "I am a debtor—so as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also." Paul recognized his debt to Rome for a system of roads unsurpassed and unequaled up to our own day. He could travel in comparative safety and comfort over well-planned and magnificently built roads that still excite our admiration. At every place and at all times he was under the protection of Roman law and the Roman legion.

Paul's boast, "I am a Roman citizen, freeborn," was no idle statement. It carried with it the protection of the greatest and the best law-observing government ever known up to the British Empire of today. Paul's appreciation of the Roman Empire was deep and sincere. "As much as in him was," he stood ready to give the best that he had to Rome. He stood ready to serve his day and his generation. In all of his writings Paul admonishes his followers to obey the lawfully constituted authorities; yet Paul was never willing to submerge conscience or liberty of speech to governmental interference.

Paul was no Fascist, nor was he a Communist. Paul stood for the utmost in individual liberty in both speech and action. Whatever "Saul of Tarsus" may have done and said as an intolerant persecutor of those that were not of his way of thinking, Paul the Apostle stood out even to a martyr's death for liberty of speech and action for the individual.

His statement before the Roman Governor, Felix, could very well be the motto of any man, "And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men." His every word, and his every action, was tempered by the conviction, "I am a debtor." Ready to fight for, even ready to die for, a conviction but also ready to spend every atom of energy of mind and body in service. Paul's breadth and depth of education made him deeply conscious that he was a debtor to past generations, to other nations, and other peoples. Such a conviction is not compatible with Fascism or Communism. Both Fascism and Communism ignore the liberty of the individual. Both are totalitarian and place the state above all.

So long as America remains true to the convictions and traditions of its founders, so long as the Constitution remains a sacred contract, only to be altered or amended by due processes of law, and does not become "a mere scrap of paper," America will continue to be a democracy, humanitarian

and altruistic in principles and actions. As a debtor to all nations, both past and present, as a debtor to men of every type, America is conscious that a liberal and generous democracy is her mission, her destiny.

To come to a practical application and to speak directly to you leaders in Southern education, I present a two-fold need. First we need a more careful selection of teachers. I am proud of our past achievements. As a charter member of this group, I can speak with an assurance born of intimate knowledge of the wonderful advance in Southern education brought about by the standards set up by our group. From chaos and inefficiency we have indeed worked wonders. Our first list of standardized secondary schools was about 150 in number and the far larger proportion of this number were private schools. Two states were not able to present a single school worthy of accreditation, while one state presented only one school that could meet our standards, low as they then were! Since then, we have raised our standards in every respect and at the same time have created such a desire upon the part of secondary schools to meet them that we now have a list of member schools of about 1,200, over a thousand of which are public secondary schools. Millions of dollars have been spent in the creation of splendid high school buildings, many of which compare favorably with colleges and universities. Twenty-five years ago, very few of the high schools could qualify with a 75 per cent college-degree faculty. I can well remember how we stretched the phrase—"must have a degree or its equivalent." We certainly stretched that word "equivalent" for all it was worth in counting experience as equal to a degree. Now we find nearly every school presenting 90 per cent or more of its teachers as possessing the bachelor's degree.

I am convinced, however, that the quality of teachers now being selected can be greatly improved. The medical profession has taken tremendous strides in the last twenty years in exercising the greatest care in the selection of applicants for admission to medical colleges. Only the cream of secondary school graduates can hope for entrance to medical schools. While we of the educational profession are not in position to demand standards as rigorous as those demanded by the doctors, we can even in spite of low salaries demand that our colleges and teacher-training schools raise standards of admission and that the lower half of the high school graduates be refused the chance to secure a more or less subsidized education for the teaching career. My own observation leads me to make the statement that men in education as a whole do not measure up with a group of physicians similarly assembled. Of all types of men, those who teach should possess personality, character, and leadership. I believe in technique and method as strongly as the best of you, but I definitely place technique and method after culture and scholarship. If I am to face the alternative of a Princeton graduate with culture, scholarship, and character, but lacking the required hours in education,

and a graduate of a normal school with no culture and a weak personality but with full requirements in educational courses, I shall choose the Princeton man! I have done so in the past, and I shall do it again. Do not misunderstand me. I do appreciate educational courses. I have paid for such advanced courses for my own teachers in the past and I am now paying the tuition for five of my faculty who are taking work in education under Professor Paul Palmer at the University of Chattanooga.

I regret to suggest another matter, but I cannot evade saying that along with the demand for higher scholarship requirements there should be very much more care taken to select for teacher-training courses those possessing inherent qualities of leadership and qualities of honor and worthwhile moral fibre. It has been brought to me time and time again from sources that I must believe that many would-be teachers cheat their way through college. I have also been reliably informed that summer sessions in our colleges have a number of teachers seeking credits who are not above the art of cribbing. To exercise greater care in selection of the teacher is to eliminate dishonesty, weak personality, and low scholarship. Any success above the ordinary that the McCallie School has had has come from the influence and work of superior teachers.[1]

[1] The following is a partial list of former instructors in McCallie, with their present positions:

Bender, L. B., Head of Manual Training Dept., Chattanooga Public Schools
Benton, F. M., Phillips Andover Academy
Briggs, George I., Headmaster, Battle Ground Academy
Brown, Marshall W., Dean, Presbyterian College
Brown, Victor, Vassar College
Cruse, S. Ridgly, Prof. of Mathematics, University of Arizona
Davidson, R. F., Head Dept. of Religion, Hiram College
Erwin, E. J., Prof. of English, Davidson College
Erwin, R. M., Prof. of Modern Language, Georgia Institute of Technology
Evans, H. C., Jr., Professor of Spanish, University of Florida
Garrell, George W., Professor of Mathematics, University of Denver
Greene, W. K., Dean of Undergraduate Instruction, Duke University
Griffin, George C., Dean of Freshmen, Georgia Institute of Technology
Guerry, Alex, President, University of Chattanooga and Vice-Chancellor-Elect, University of the South
Harris, L. H., Instructor in History, University of Wisconsin
Johnsonius, A. L., Millersburg Military Institute
Kelley, J. A., Professor of Modern Language, Swathmore College
Lester, L. M., Superintendent of Schools, Griffin, Ga.
Lilly, H. T., Professor of English, Davidson College
McMillan, T. H. Commissioner of Education
Parkinson, Gordon G., Erskine College
Pierson, Paul I., President, Swathmore Chautauqua Association
Quigg, B. F., Superintendent of Schools, Rome, Georgia
Simpson, J. C., President, Stratford College
Smith, Stanton E., Instructor, Chattanooga High School
Suthon, A. M., Professor of Law, Tulane University
Sydnor, Charles S., Professor of History, University of Mississippi
Robson, Charles B., Professor of History, University of North Carolina
Tate, William, Assistant Dean, University of Georgia
Thomason, R. F., Registrar, University of Tennessee
Thompson, J. W., Instructor, Anderson High School
Varnell, Charles, Instructor of English, University of Virginia
Wilcox, C. R., President, Darlington School
Wren, F. Lynwood, Professor of Mathematics, Peabody Teachers College

The second need I wish to present is the need for the development of leaders in the secondary schools and colleges. It must be admitted that the totalitarian states are bending the wills and directing the actions of youth in a far more effective way toward attaining their goals than are the democratic states in moulding the youth entrusted to their keeping. The totalitarian states know exactly what they want, and they know exactly how to get it. We are not altogether certain as to our goal and we are even more hazy as to the means in reaching the goal. Read *Harper's Monthly* for last October for the remarkable article entitled, "Sons of the Wolf." As I read of how the totalitarian states are using education to foist and maintain false principles, I cannot help feeling that we have not begun to educate for democracy. We are not instilling in our own youth as deep a sense of obligation and debtorship to society as we could and should do. In our tremendous effort to educate all, we fail to educate the gifted for leadership. It is my experience that if we, at McCallie, can secure the right attitude of the few that are naturally endowed with leadership, they in turn will surround themselves with a somewhat larger group of enthusiastic followers. The entire group is thus motivated along right lines.

I am not overlooking the irreducible few that always oppose, but I am stating they can be made an ineffective minimum. With teachers of character and leadership that know what democracy is and who believe it to be worth working for and who realize that it is the few and not the many that can take the leadership, democracy can yet take hope. It is the Pauls, the Calvins, Luthers, Wesleys, Whitfields, and—to come to our own day and time—the Karl Barths, the Martin Niemöllers, that must save democracy. It is the genuine leaders that must not be neglected in an effort to educate all that we are to look to for our salvation, but not for one moment am I intimating that the mass be neglected. I am simply urging that we do not overlook the potentially powerful minority in whom is the directing force of the future. I am not a pessimist, but I stand here this afternoon saying that it may be necessary for us to fight for our convictions. The totalitarian states are aggressive and militant; we may be forced in self-defense to be as aggressive and as militant. Paul died for his convictions, but his convictions sway the Christian world of today.

May this America of ours, this great democracy, find in our teachers and in their gifted pupils such characters as Paul. May they all be able to exclaim: "I am a debtor to a wonderful inheritance enriched by the blood of countless martyrs. I also stand ready, as much as in me is, to uphold and hand down to coming generations this inheritance." May they exercise themselves "to have always a conscience void of offense toward God, and toward men."

The Social Background of Secondary Education*

By Doak S. Campbell

Director of Division of Surveys, Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee

Disturbances in the field of secondary education are not new. Certain fundamental issues that have recently been brought into the focus of attention have persisted in American secondary schools for nearly three centuries. Time and again serious attempts have been made to incorporate into a single type of institution an educational program which would serve with equal effectiveness two types of educational objectives whose basic philosophies were, or at least seemed to be, diametrically opposed.

On the one hand is a program designed to meet the needs of a selected group of youth whose mental equipment recommends them as promising material for scholarly pursuits. They have stood the test of a rigorous discipline. According to Jefferson, they have been "raked from the rubbish." Scholarship, mental discipline, minimum essentials, required sequences, achievement standards, academic excellence, mastery—such terms are the time-honored shibboleths that have served through the years. These things are not to be considered lightly. However, such a program cannot consistently be concerned with a multiplicity of activities and interests that are usually designated as practical or non-academic. Attention to such matters under the guise of education, we are told, tends to "lower standards," to weaken the educational process, to dissipate and discredit scholarship. Such a program cannot be adjusted to the needs of the "many" without sacrificing the best interests of the "few" in whom lie the possibilities of intellectual leadership.

On the other hand is a program designed to meet the needs of all youth, regardless of whether or not their mental equipment recommends them as promising material for scholarly pursuits. The tendency of such a program has been to emphasize the non-academic, the "practical," manual activity, as contrasted with intellectual activity. Immediate vocational interests are considered of primary importance. A wide variety of activities is necessary in order that each individual may pursue his own particular interest. However, such a program has tended to become as highly formal and as rigidly disciplinary in many respects as the traditional academic program which it was designed to supplement, or—supplant, as some would have us believe.

Extreme differences of opinion have been developed regarding the strength or the weakness of each of these points of view. Sharp controversy has tended to emphasize these disagreements. Recriminations have been hurled

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1938.

by proponents of both sides. At times the controversy has been childish. Vested interests have fought stoutly to maintain their position. Still the problem persists. One could wish devoutly that enthusiasts for either type of program might seek points of agreement rather than disagreement, that each might strive to understand the other's point of view.

While the conflict has gone merrily on with comparatively little change in the fundamental point of view or method of attack, something has been happening with respect to the youth whom the secondary schools are designed to serve. It is to this aspect of the problem that we turn our attention at this time.

Constitutional and legislative provisions for free public education reflect quite generally the assumption that opportunities should be available to all youth until, or even through, their twenty-first year. And, although there has been a phenomenal growth in the enrollments in secondary schools during the present century, by no means are all of the youth securing the advantages of free public education.

Enthusiastic reports seem to indicate that from 60 to 70 per cent of our youth of high school age are now being served by the secondary school. On its face this would seem to be cause for gratification. However, a critical analysis of the available facts yields a less favorable picture. Assuming that the number of pupils enrolled in the secondary schools of the nation is equal to 60 per cent of the total number of youth of normal high school age, we must remember that some of those enrolled are under fourteen and a great many are over seventeen years of age. In reality then, the number of youth of normal age for high school who are enrolled in secondary school is approximately one-third of the total population of those ages.

Just why approximately two-thirds of our youth of appropriate high school age are not in school cannot be easily stated. However, there is strong indication that maladjustments within the school constitute a major cause. The extent of elimination which takes place progressively through the school course is cause for great concern. The enrollment in the second year is approximately 85 per cent of the first year's enrollment; that of the third year, 70 per cent; and that of the fourth year, 62 per cent. Approximately 52 per cent of the entering freshmen graduate four years later.

There are many, of course, who believe that such a condition is desirable because it reflects high standards. There are others, however, and that number appears to be increasing, who believe that the secondary school should provide suitable educational opportunities for all youth for such a time as may be necessary to equip them for effective participation in society. They believe nonetheless in the necessity of providing adequately for academic excellency wherever the interests and needs of the pupils justify it. Their emphasis on other types of opportunities is accentuated by the general neglect that is reflected in school mortality. The failure of the secondary

school to hold its pupils represents a social wastage which can scarcely be defended in a democratic state. The general concern over the present situation is reflected in the following series of questions propounded in the current yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators:

> How can school mortality be decreased? Can a continued education be made more attractive to more students? Is it conceivable that many drop out of school because the curriculum has not satisfied their needs? Can these needs be defined for the pupil by pupil guidance? After the pupil has left school, can school authorities be of any help to him? Is the average student prepared for living with a high school education? If school mortality cannot be decreased, can a high school education be made to mean more in the way of life preparation?[1]

Such questions have become of more concern in the light of certain social conditions which have been brought to our attention with dramatic intensity in recent years. These conditions are summarized in a recent publication growing out of the work of the Advisory Committee on Education,[2] as follows:

> The intensely rapid growth of population, the full impingement of industrial expansion and organization on economic and social life, and the final limitation of the frontier together have operated to force the American people into a recognition of population problems as a whole. As might be expected, various groups in the population have been faced with problems peculiar to themselves. Children were menaced with the oppressive conditions of child labor; poorly educated peasant immigrants suffered from industrial exploitation; and old people were faced with dismissal, abandonment, and economic insecurity. The problems of chief concern to youth, as one of these major groups, related primarily to education and employment. Job specialization demanded a more deliberate and specific form of vocational training; intelligent participation in civic affairs called for a more extensive and prolonged period of general education; and the complexity of social participation necessitated a period of conscious orientation and guidance.

The publication states further that as a result of the recent major economic depression the Federal Government endeavored to meet the need in part through its emergency program. Of necessity *relief* was the primary motive. But it soon became evident that emergency relief alone could not provide an adequate solution. To a considerable extent, the relief program included constructive educational activities which served to some extent to resolve the fundamental problems of social and individual maladjustment. But even the large programs, principally the NYA and the CCC, served only a fraction of the needy and maladjusted youth of our country.

According to available census data, one-sixth of the present population of the United States is composed of persons of ages sixteen to twenty-five

[1] From *Youth Education Today*, Sixteenth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, 1938.

[2] The National Youth Administration, Monograph No. 13 of the Advisory Committee on Education, Washington, D. C., 1938.

years. However, due to a declining birth rate the proportion may be expected to become progressively smaller until such time as the population structure and size may have become fairly stable. In 1870 there were two persons over twenty-five to every youth of ages fifteen to twenty-five; by 1930 this ratio had risen to three to one; and it is estimated that by 1960 it will be four to one. However, these youth constitute the first line cohort of society and, as such, require concentrated attention.

The significance of the problem is accentuated by the fact that approximately as many of these youth are out of school and out of work as are in school. Almost one-fourth of all registration at public employment offices are youth. Many youth have been out of school for several years, two, three, or even five, before they obtain their first full-time job. There is apparently an inverse ratio between the amount of schooling they have received and the length of time they wait for employment. For this condition of affairs the schools are not wholly to blame; however, to the extent that their programs of study are insufficiently diversified and adapted to the individual needs of the student, the fault is theirs.

The problem of unemployment among youth is not local nor is it temporary. No solution for it, so far as possible employment conditions are concerned, is in sight. Society, through some organized means, must provide for them. The principal means at hand is in the schools. When we face conditions squarely we must admit that education has fumbled its chance in the case of literally thousands of youth who will not again present themselves for its benefits.

Obviously, a program of education which becomes more or less ineffective at ages sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen cannot be changed at once into a program which provides adequately for all youth. A transition period is involved which should be dealt with as such over the next several years. During this period means must be devised which will tend to attract youth back into the schools, and will hold more effectively those already in the schools.

For direction in developing a more effective school program we must keep continuously aware of current social and economic problems which affect our youth, such as those to which we have called your attention. It is not enough to study gross data on a national scale. Means must be developed for interpreting social conditions which call for attention on the part of the schools. It follows that great courage should be exercised to carry forward a program which provides appropriately for all youth.

Instruction in the Secondary School*

By Mildred English
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Georgia

One of the chief problems confronting a group of teachers concerned with the development of an educational program to meet the needs of the pupils and the community they are to serve is that of building a common philosophy as the basis of thinking and working together. The philosophy of education of such a group will be determined by the way they look at the life of the community, the pupils—their present and future needs, their home background, the agencies of the community which are contributing to the education of its youth—and the problems the citizens of that community face as they go about their daily life and work.

In the Peabody School, which is the laboratory school of the Georgia State College for Women, we agree that the school should give to the students:

a. Varied experiences in living and working together as a group,
b. The necessary tools, techniques, and habits of work for securing an education,
c. A rich background of content and experience as they are introduced to the cultural heritage of the race,
d. The ability to meet and solve problems,
e. A point of view about life which will serve as a guide to living, and
f. A feeling for and an appreciation of beauty, and a desire to express it in their surroundings.

These things we feel can best be done as children have opportunities for planning, creating, initiating, sharing, conferring, accepting responsibilities, mastering, using skills and techniques. We try, therefore, to develop with them a program that will make these things possible.

Our educational program, in all its aspects, is organized on the basis of those persistent problems of living that every human being must face—how to keep well, how to make a living, how to get along with people, how to enjoy art and beauty, how to adjust to environment, how to build character, how to communicate effectively, how to get from the cultural heritage those things of most worth, what type of government is best suited to present-day life, and so on. Such problems are constant throughout life. The experiences and materials may, and do, differ on different levels of maturity and in different localities. These problems do not stay in a single field.

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1938.

They do not appear singly, or in any given order. They cross-section subject fields and draw from many sources as they are interwoven with living. These problems we restate from time to time as the staff study the developing program, but always they are our guide in checking for breadth and depth of experience, and to insure that there are no gaps in the program of the individual and of the group.

We are trying to develop a type of integrated program around certain general themes in each year, allowing two hour periods for group work and planning. In the first year, the work is growing out of a study of "Living and Working in the Community." The teachers of English and civics and science are largely responsible for the work and the exploratory planning was done by this group. Others who have been brought in are the teachers of art, music, health, home economics, mathematics, the school librarian, and people from the community—the mayor, to discuss safety measures, the county health officer, the county 4-H club director, the supervisor of the curb market, the president of the garden club and of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and so on.

This group of forty-eight girls entering first-year high school came from the seventh grade of our school and from five county two-year high schools. They faced the problems of getting acquainted with each other, the high school organization and schedule, a group of new teachers, where formerly they had worked with one teacher; of exploring together the things they liked to do, and to read; the studies they enjoyed; the courses they would elect; the special subjects (music, art, physical education) they wished to take; of working out a schedule for classes, study, and recreation; of developing plans for living and working together as a group; of getting their home room ready for work, assembling books, materials, arranging bulletin boards, making the room an attractive place for work and study, providing places for filing and keeping materials; and of the determination of the problems for the year's work.

The class spent one period a day, the first week, discussing what the members hoped to do and what courses in high school during the four years would best prepare for these vocations. Schedules were arranged and the pupils met each class and new teacher, in turn. Peabody students helped new girls learn to know the new teachers and how to use the school equipment, as well as to understand Peabody standards and ways of living.

The two-hour period set aside for this group to work together has been used in planning, study, reciting, going on field trips, and so on. Teachers of English, science, and civics have been available to work with the entire group, or with groups from the class. At times all three teachers are with the group, participating in the class discussion, at the same period.

Discussion of problems to be considered during the year in which English, science, and civics could help brought out the problems of the individual

as a citizen in the home, the school, and the community—local, county, state, nation, and world. It was agreed that since the home is the first place in which we gain any experience in learning to live together, the group would start its study from the point of view of how to make it a happier place to live. After some discussion the members of the group decided that the chief factors are coöperation, understanding, and a willingness to share responsibility, if a happy home is to result. As they formulated their ideas, under the guidance of the civics teacher, the English teacher helped them in making outlines and in organizing the problems for work. Bulletin boards were arranged, showing attractive homes, the duties of members of the family, activities of the home, and so on. Here the home economics teacher came into the group and worked with them for some days, as they studied how to improve living conditions in the home.

Home reading came to the fore, for a time, and this gave a good opportunity to discuss books, magazines, and newspapers in the home. An outcome of this discussion was a feeling of need for newspapers in the classroom, not only because it was not always convenient to read them while at home, but also because some of the members of the class did not have access to them at home. Accordingly they appointed committees to see to it that several different newspapers were brought to school daily. Thus developed a need for learning how to read the newspaper, and of the evaluation of news.

Lists of books read during vacation were made, and the English teacher showed the correct way to keep bibliographies of readings done, of setting up a scheme for keeping an account of reading through the year. The radio came in for its share of discussion, whereupon certain programs were recommended for home listening. This has been continued through the year, and the group have consulted many sources in order to be able to recommend the radio programs of interest to different members of the family and to the members of their class group.

The part science plays in the home came up in connection with modern improvements that have been made to make easier the work of the homemaker. Here the science teacher took the lead in directing the group's activities. A very comprehensive list was made by the group of ways in which science touches the home, but because of time limitations it was decided to confine their activities to a detailed study of heating, ventilation, prevention of home accidents, and prevention and elimination of insect pests at that time. In connection with the study of home accidents, the group listed those of frequent occurrence, formulated common sense rules for their prevention, decided upon essential home equipment for the treatment of accidents that might occur. The health teacher and the school physician worked with the group at this time. Insect pests in the home came in for a rather detailed study, various committees investigating the

life history, breeding places, injury from, and control of these pests. Especial attention was given to the malarial mosquito and the group, noticeably those members who had recently had cases of malaria, decided to help in controlling the breeding places of mosquitoes in the community. And thus the plan is developing.

Because of the size of the class, the large group could not be kept together at all times for efficient work; and as interests and needs have appeared, groups have been forming and reforming to undertake certain problems and report to the class. The suggestion has just come from one of the teachers that members of the group who perhaps will not go on to college have an opportunity to develop their special problems growing out of the development of their own homes, the rural community centers, arts and crafts, marketing and gardening, conservation, helping them see a new dignity and beauty in the work of their own community as they have an opportunity to do with their hands and their hearts as well as with their minds.

In the second year, biology, home economics, and English teachers have planned the work in terms of "The Development of the Individual in Social and Group Living." The major integrated unit is directed by the teacher of biology who is concerned first with helping the girl understand the growth and development of herself as a person. The home economics teacher works closely with the group, here, as does the health teacher. The report from the physical examination of each girl was studied by the girl and the teacher. The foods class in the college coöperated in this study and proposed ways and means of overcoming difficulties of the underweight or overweight girl, helped plan diet lists, exercises, and so on, for the individual student. These college girls in many instances became good friends of the high school pupils they advised, meeting them from time to time and talking over all sorts of personal problems. This work has been continued through the year. Physical education and health, art, music, all come in for a share in the work of this group. All girls are included in the program, working together at the periods scheduled for integrating purposes. Individuals and groups take problems to the various departments and laboratories for further work. At present a workshop plan is developing in the home economics laboratory. During this period each girl works at her own problem, or two or three girls work together, the teacher and the student teachers going from one group to another, offering suggestions and asking questions, as they help the girls build standards, develop good work habits, and evaluate results obtained. Problems of dress, personal care, and grooming, of how to meet people, how to be interested in people, and how to become interesting people themselves, all are of real importance to the girls of this age, and they are eager to find ways of going about solving them. This takes them into the content fields, requires wide reading, and help in planning recreation, in choosing radio programs, movies, and so on. Many

opportunities are given for social experiences, at school and in the community—dances, skating parties, observance of the special holidays, and often teas for their own or another group, or for visitors or the mothers of the class.

In the junior year a large number of our girls come from the two-year high schools of the county. These girls have not had the same type of school experience as the students who have come through the Peabody school, nor have they had as varied and rich a background of experience in many cases. The work of this year is concerned with "The Art of Living in the Home"—the school home as well as the family home. Here again home economics and science work together very closely. Music, art, English, and mathematics play an equally important part in the development of this integrated experience. The work is built on problems that concern the home group—food, its selection, preparation, and serving; clothing, a sen s of values, what and how to buy, shopping centers, mail order business; the right dress for the right occasion; good grooming; voice and what makes a good conversationalist; interest in people and current happenings, the difference between being interested and "gossiping"; and many similar problems. The reading that is done, selecting magazines for the home, and building one's own library present problems calling for the help of the English teacher. The use of the home's facilities, the girl's own room, the use of the living room, the radio, the phone, the car, all come in for discussion as the girls try to work themselves and determine what books, departments, and people can give them help in their study. They are much interested in checking on themselves in order to know how they are improving. Members of this group have been to the principal's office, twice, recently to ask if there are any tests or check sheets available for some phase of their study.

Out of this survey and planning period grew some laboratory work in the English room. The students of one group have made, with the help of the art teacher, a beautiful brown and gold bound book called "What We Read," in which they keep their individual reading lists with whatever comments they care to make. This is not teacher-directed, though the teacher adds her list to the book also. Every Friday this group holds a "Book-Sharing Hour." Books reported include the latest best sellers, old classics, biographies, and periodical literature. During the winter they frequently asked to exchange classrooms with one of the home economics groups for this hour in order that they might have tea or some simple refreshments prepared by a committee of the group at this time.

Recently this group have been interested in "career literature." Girls in the class who plan to be nurses have been particularly interested in such books as "The Doctor," "Private Worlds," "The American Doctor's Odyssey," "Arrowsmith," "The Story of San Michele," "Florence Nightingale."

Many career lists are forming. This interest grew out of a study of personality, which was a part of the integrated unit.

The psychology teacher at the college asked to give to some group in the high school a personality test. This group was eager to take the test and very much interested in the scores and in following up things the students did not know. They disagreed with some of the "answers" and were ready to follow through to sources to see who was the authority for the statement made and what other points of view may be held.

Another group from this class interested themselves in creative writing. They gave one month to sponsoring a contest in creative writing—"without prizes," they said, "just for the joy of achievement." In this way they started a collection of the best work that is being done in the high school and hope to be able to publish it in printed or mimeographed form before the end of the year. They hope to share this with certain other schools whose magazines and papers they have enjoyed. This group did a good piece of work in securing interest in the contest and in getting contributions from all members of the class and from other classes. In many instances the group suggested to girls topics they were particularly fitted to write about. The teacher helped direct their thinking along this line. To one Jewish girl they suggested that she was the only girl in school who could write an article about her feelings on the Jewish purge and persecution. The idea appealed to her and she turned in a very fine bit called "I am a Jew." Another girl, who was fast forming an inferiority complex because she worked in a ten-cent store on Saturdays, was helped to see that she was the only member of the class who could portray cleverly the stream of humanity that passes through the "dime store" on Saturday.

This group was composed of the average students of the large class of eighty-four and none of them were particularly adapted to lead in such a project. Therefore, we have been quite pleased at the stimulating influence of this undertaking throughout the school. Another group from this class is concerned with the news for the school. The student council has undertaken as its major objective for the year the establishment of a school paper. The junior class was asked to experiment with ways in which a paper could be issued and financed, looking toward making it a permanent feature of the school program. Four groups within the class put out sample papers in order to see what deficiencies in news writing might appear and to know what training they most needed before they were ready for a real paper. We are fortunate to have as the teacher a person who has had much experience in writing for newspapers and magazines and who herself finds real joy in this work. The girls working on this problem were amazed to learn that newspapers are not as simply and as easily produced as they may seem. Much talent was discovered, along with much very mediocre work. Unlooked-for cartooning and art talent was evidenced, and one girl who

had never done well in English was found to have a real gift for handling the sports news. The main value of this work was that the students themselves began to see clearly that rather than turning aside from English while working on the paper, they needed more than ever to know how to spell, how to write sentences, what participles and infinitives are, how to divide words at the end of the line, and so on.

This class, also, sponsors a daily bulletin for the high school students, in the main hall, through which a different editor each day makes special announcements of Peabody activities, calls attention to worthwhile radio programs, new books added to the library, or outstanding pictures at the downtown theatre.

The integrating theme for the senior year is "The Essentials of American Civilization and Culture." Here the English and social studies teachers are in charge. Each teacher is directing a section of the group, taking care of the English, history, and literature as the work develops. At times the sections exchange work while the "specialist" develops some special phase of the study. Music, art, science, home economics, gardening, landscaping, architecture, mathematics, health and physical education have all contributed to the development of this unit.

In the beginning of the year the girls and the teachers listed the problems they thought should come into the study, starting with the practical problems that touch daily living for them as American citizens—the home, ownership, furnishings and interior decorations, and how to select, repair, and refinish furniture. The home economics and art departments were helpful with these problems as were many home owners in the community. The mathematics department worked with the group on the problems of how to save and how to spend, investments, and business practices.

Food and clothing problems had to do with selection, wise buying, the evaluation of advertisements, and the preparation and serving of foods for many types of occasions. Health and safety in the home and family relationships presented problems that called for help from the departments of health, science, home economics, and psychology. College departments helped here, through student teachers and as members of the college faculty came to talk to the girls or they took problems to the college professors for advice. Problems of economic and industrial life, making a living, took the group into a study of the chief industries of the state and nation and of conditions in the industrial world. This led to a study of vocations for women, qualifications, vocations least crowded, new jobs and vocational possibilities growing out of modern inventions and ways of living, how to get a job, and to avocations and hobbies.

Turning to the "so-called" cultural phases of our development, again the girls wished to begin with the personal—social graces, what makes Southern charm and hospitality, how to develop tact and personality, how

to choose friends, how to control irritating habits, consideration of the privacy of others, how to develop poise, good posture, good grooming, and how to show courtesy in their dealings with others. How to carry on an interesting conversation brought out a need for wide reading and knowledge of current happenings, a wide range of interests. This took the girls into content subjects, English expression, literature, music, art, the stage and screen, and the radio. The members of the group have come to feel that the individual and the country grow in much the same way, as they consider that growth from the point of view of political, economic, social, and intellectual development. This study thus grows into community citizenship, community health, and the building of character of the individual as the basis for home and community development.

We are trying with our seniors this year a *service course* in English and in mathematics, to which students go for work on personal problems and shortcomings and for the purpose of summarizing and pointing up the work in these fundamentals at the end of the high school course. In addition to the work of these various integrating centers, other groups and departments are coöperating in the work that calls for solving common problems. This spring the teachers of physics and mathematics, of geometry and art, of social studies and modern languages, are working together on problems to which both contribute.

In this work we have developed classroom laboratories in English, social science, art, the languages, and home economics, to which children go as individuals or as groups to work with the teacher in charge and with the materials in a laboratory situation. Tables, cabinets, and book shelves contain usable materials assembled by teachers and students. Books are brought from school and college libraries and from homes as special problems and needs appear and are later replaced by others as the work progresses. Students and teachers share magazines, books, and papers in these laboratories. Two of the groups take the Sunday New York *Times* for their classroom use.

Our school library and materials room is one feature of the school equipment that makes for efficiency in this type of work. A number of times during the year new books are added. These are selected by teacher and children. Groups go to the book store, examine book catalogues, and read book reviews, as they build the list from which they buy. During "Book Week" and at Christmas, an exhibit of books is sent from a store in Atlanta which we enjoy looking over as we decide the ones we wish to buy as individuals or for the library. We have a very good selection of magazines and papers in the high school library, too, and the girls may use the college library, where there is an excellent magazine collection.

The "materials room and professional library" is housed in the room adjoining the school library. Here are courses of study, text books, work

books and laboratory manuals and professional books for the use of the teachers and student teachers. Vertical files, pictures, slides, victrola records, maps, charts, bulletins, catalogued according to topics and units, are available for use in that room, or to be checked out for use in the classrooms of the school.

The children are a part of the planning of the program of the school, not alone in the classroom situations. They help select and place pictures for halls, and exhibits for display case and help also with arrangement of flowers and school furnishings. Programs, the observance of special seasons, parties, teas, picnics, trips, the entertainment of visitors, all offer the children an opportunity to share in the life of the school. We do not have extracurricular activities as such. The activities of the school grow out of the interests of the group and are a part of the life of the school. The student council serves as a very good clearing house for the school as its members consider the needs of the pupils and try to find individuals and groups who will undertake to solve the problems presented. While there is an adviser for this group, it frequently asks other teachers and parents to meet with it to discuss ways and means of meeting some special problem.

Records are kept by teacher and children together. Each girl has a folder to which she contributes samples of work, reading lists, records of problems undertaken, test papers, and so on, which she discusses with the teacher from time to time. The teacher gives her suggestions and criticisms to the girl, and it is recorded there with the date of the conference. Later entries are made to show what the girl did to follow up the suggestions.

Pupil reports are given in terms of whether the girl is doing satisfactory work or unsatisfactory work. The work is evaluated in terms of the individual girl and her progress and the next steps for her. Elective subjects enable the girl to shape her course through high school so as to meet the requirements of college or future training. Guidance is an essential part of the work as it develops through the four years. We are striving to help our girls develop to the fullest possible extent their capabilities, living happily with their group from day to day, as they learn to use effectively the tools of learning that will enable them to continue their education as long as they live. To this end we strive to open doors ahead of them and to help them choose the doors through which they will explore life. Let me give you an excerpt from an article written by one of our seniors to greet the New Year, to give you her point of view:

> Into my hands this day is placed a new rosary. As I gaze into the depths of the pearls, I know that, when the year has passed, I shall have caressed each, one by one; for each pearl is an unborn day. I know that then by the warmness of my heart I shall have made them glowing and alive, or by its coldness, dark, dismal, and forlorn. Only I can bring forth the worth of these pearls, and so I breathe a prayer of consecration. . . .[1]

[1] Blanche Muldrow, Senior, Peabody High School.

We do not wish to send our girls out with the same pattern of living, but to help them see, as Sara Teasdale expresses it, that

> "Life has loveliness to sell,
> All beautiful and splendid things—
> Blue waves whitened on a cliff,
> Soaring fire that sways and sings,
> And children's faces looking up
> Holding wonder like a cup."

The American Secondary School and the Liberal Arts College*

By Richard M. Gummere
Director of Admissions, Harvard University

There are as many points of view regarding the relationship of the school to the college as there are shades of difference in the educational philosophy of individuals and communities. Some say preparation for a trade or profession; some say equipment for leisure hours; some emphasize the making of the citizen through study of civic affairs; others, the acquisition of culture; others recommend at as early a stage as possible the development of a specialty; and still others warn us that we should train boys and girls from the socialized group angle rather than from that of the isolated individual. Probably they are all correct—and we should, like the Thinker in Browning's poem, "combine *all* moods, inventing *one*." Since the particular text, so to speak, that I am emphasizing does not concern the student who is definitely and finally not planning to enter college, it would seem that all these points of view should be taken into consideration by those who expect to enter some institution of higher education, and that there should be an almost unlimited number of permutations and combinations, especially in the curricular offerings of the candidate.

One need not therefore destroy anything traditional, or, on the other hand, look askance at any of the excellent procedures which modern study and expert discovery have developed. They are all ready to hand from Euclid to Thurstone and from Julius Caesar to the latest textbook on "Problems of Democracy." There may be a two-way track—college and non-college—or a five-way approach as Dr. John Tildsley advocated in his Inglis Lecture. Except for a few pursuits which belong obviously to the post-school apprenticeship to a trade, anything seriously followed through is worth while. The conservative and the radical need not any longer stand in opposition. Figures furnished by Dr. Altstetter in his paper on "The Philosophy of Education of Two Hundred Secondary Schools," in the recent Coöperative Study survey, page 3, show that the opinion of 162 principals emphasized "cultural values" and 165 emphasized "practical values" —thus putting the two objectives on an even basis. We are all relieved that this opinion of ours as to an educational creed has been proved by these figures; for it shows that the guerilla warfare between vocational and cultural studies has died down. Many of us remember the beginning of this *rev*olution which has now happily become an *ev*olution. We recall the ex-

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1938.

citement about 1920 when there was wild enthusiasm over the Smith-Towner and the Smith-Hughes bills for vocational training on the one hand, and the nation-wide enrollment of members for the American Classical League on the other hand. There were courses marked off like club-breakfasts for each type of boy or girl, unfortunately cutting away the academic college prospects from the young person who elected a vocational program, and conversely denying certain practical studies of great value to the youth who elected a series of literary, linguistic, advanced mathematical, or social science approaches to higher education.

One might trace this sort of controversy, era by era and even year by year, as Mr. Mark Sullivan did with the development of American institutions in our times. But as the intelligent observer notes present-day conditions through the country, he or she is convinced that these high-light emphases have given place to a well-balanced background of coördinated interests. Each group has made its contribution—vocational, progressive, conservative; and we are the gainers if we can consolidate at this point. We are fortunate in having had such guides to help us out of the "misty mid-region" of adolescent problems, all the way from Dr. Lowell, who defined the best education as "self-education," to the inventor of the automatic "Markometer" which catalogues certain details of the pupil's progress with mechanical accuracy. We are now, in all sensible groups of thinkers, aware of the need for every boy and girl to pursue a proper balance of the handicraft and the cultural; we do not wish to make the mistake of the ancient Greeks, who retained the world's guidance in the hands of the leisured class and left the world's craftsmanship to slaves. Nor yet do we desire the converse mistake of modern Soviet Russia, which regards every school program as a venture along industrial lines. I hope that we are intent to keep before our eyes a sane ideal of progress, not vitiated by too much technique and not watered down with an inadequate culture which has no relation to life-situations. We desire to follow Professor Judd to a reasonable extent when he tells us that "We must guide education by applying to this field of human endeavor the same forms of scientific analysis that have been successful in the mastery of the physical world," heeding at the same time the warning of Mr. Albert Jay Nock that machinery is not a substitute for thought, that literacy does not mean education, that there is a cultural tradition which must not disappear, and that mere instrumental knowledge cannot take the place of formative knowledge. To put it epigrammatically, the laboratory and Plato must be closely associated nowadays; and it is significant that two of the leading commentators on the topic of "Whither Higher Education"—President Hutchins and Professor Alfred North Whitehead—both base the fundamentals of their creed upon principles enunciated by Plato; and both refer to Plato as the guide for the intellectual life. He has thus become the Doer rather than the cloudland

philosopher of antiquity. If I may quote you one piece of testimony to this general article of our creed, it will be from Rodin—that creative genius whom one could not catalogue as either "cultural" or "vocational" exclusively. "It is a strange mistake to imagine that the true artist can be content to remain only a skilled workman, and that he needs no intelligence. . . . When a good sculptor models a statue, whatever it is, he must first clearly conceive the general idea; then, until his task is ended, he must keep this idea of the whole in his mind in order to subordinate and ally it to every smallest detail of his work. And this is not accomplished without an intense effort of mind and concentration of thought."

This would indicate that our curricula—even for those who are *not* planning for college entrance—should be not hard-and-fast separate tracks of vocational courses, but patterns which are as highly individualized as possible for each pupil, and compounded in all cases of both cultural and practical—again, even for those who *are* going to a liberal arts college as well as to the candidates for technical schools.

Taking for granted the moral issues, the right attitude towards study, the proper emotional balance which grows more and more as a criterion of fitness to cope with college work, a health program which makes all these things possible, and a reasonable number of the best tests and examinations, one naturally comes to the conclusion that a curriculum which satisfies both interest and aptitude is a vital element for our purposes. This is the crux of those difficult years with which this address deals—the last two years of high school and the first half of the liberal arts college course. It is admitted by all educators that while the elementary grades are satisfactorily handled in the United States and while the professional, graduate, or technical stages at the other end of the line have developed to a high degree of effectiveness, this middle period of our educational process is still problematical.

I wish to suggest a curricular procedure which combines the scientific method of educational advancement and at the same time will restore the habit of imaginative and rational thinking. This will involve a synthetic rather than an analytical point of view. By the "synthetic" point of view, I mean a pattern of procedure rather than an omission of any traditional features. The admission process from school to college should never rely on a single point of approach, as in the old days when the school certificate alone or the subject-matter test alone, or the guess-work interview alone, was used. We need the school record, the principal's report (especially some testimony on emotional balance), a personal interview whenever possible, some written subject-matter and content examinations, an I. Q. or scholastic aptitude criterion, achievement data by cumulative record cards, personal letters from outside sources, reasons given by the candidate himself for his choice of a college, and frank information from parent or guard-

ian for the use of the dean. And with all this, we need a carefully thought-out curriculum, containing what Dr. Francis M. Froelicher, formerly president of the Progressive Education Association, and now headmaster of the Fountain Valley School in Colorado, has defined as "orthodoxy of direction, and liberality in the desired path to the goal."

This synthetic process is all the more workable now because we have come to see that theory and practice, like the above-mentioned vocational and cultural contrasts, are being reconciled. We have noticed all about us the inadequate antinomies of economic and government theory echoing and reverberating in classroom and in journalistic media, yet without effect in business and politics. We are dissatisfied with this and we are doing something about it—as in the new Littauer School of Public Service established at Harvard and the Nieman bequest to encourage a more vital approach to journalism. It is this sort of effort, applied to home problems and student councils in our schools, with proper control of the rising flood of interest in social studies, and devoted to expert research in such institutions as those first mentioned, and in the social work program at Chicago University, which will reduce the gangster and the ward-heeler to the Least Common Multiple and elevate the conscientious expert to the Highest Common Factor.

One feels nothing but optimism for the spirit in which we are trying to get away from the bulk of meaningless theory which has been superinduced into what we have called the "*practical*" subjects, to such an extent that many of us today would define the so-called *unpractical* subjects as more valuable and workable than the former. We realize that if this undesirable New Deal habit of over-theorizing practicality keeps up, we shall discover the traditional subjects of the curriculum, regarded as vocational in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and until recently conceived of as visionary and out-worn—we shall discover these traditional subjects, if newly interpreted at certain intervals, to be the only practical and workable elements in the curriculum. Overdone realism always goes sour, as in late Greek sculpture, modern fiction, self-centered poetry, and French literature before the surrealists stocked it with fresh words. It is only the permanent fundamentals which can be the basis for fresh symbols.

Our aim is praiseworthy. We have set up machinery planned to suit the mass-mind and at the same time to promote individual superiority; we have also reached a point where we see the value of uniting theory and practice. And now that the expansion period, with its grasp of varied technique, is over, we must add thoroughness to our flexibility.

The people of 1767 had, to be sure, a limited curriculum with a limited number to whom it was applicable; but the content of this curriculum performed a vital function and was correlated with the civic, business, and philosophical activities of the period. The people of 1837, whom Emerson

really addressed in his famous Phi Beta Kappa oration with this idea in view, had lost the principle of *quality*, had not yet learned how to cope with the New Democracy, and had not yet adjusted the cultural compass. We are trying to do both, with the experience of the past at our service. To do this we should, like a good runner who must sprint almost beyond his powers if he wishes to win the race, realize the value and apply in practice the fundamentals which will give us such advantages. For we are on the verge of a Great Awakening if we can make such a combination.

We must go deeper into the core of the individual mind. We must concentrate rather than diffuse. It has been said of the poetry of Robert Frost that its essence and its appeal are derived "as much from the inflection as from the idea"; and Frost's advice to "build soil" and "plow back" indicates, as his reviewer Ralph Thompson remarked, that the "change in man himself is even more important than change in the relation of man to man." In Frost's poetry and Grant Wood's painting, and the historical works of Douglas Southall Freeman, we get this depth of thought combined with feeling—as in the Rodin passage which was mentioned above. In our music we have not yet arrived: a critic recently remarked that there is so much in America to digest and combine that a great creative composition may still be too colossal an attainment for any single individual. The difficulty is due, says the critic—"to want of character, mediocrity of the sheer human stuff that betrays itself when the attention is transferred from artifice and technique to the *core* that they surround."

Now it is hardly fair to compare these isolated or at any rate gigantically individualized Masters of Craft in poetry and painting and music to the unformed neophytes whom we are hoping to send collegeward. But the underlying truth is the same for both the master and the beginner. The flavor of inspiration, the kernel of the process, is vital for each. There is no more hardship in such wise concentration on fundamentals than in a more superficial diffusion; in fact, there would be much less strain in "building soil" for a child of fourteen than in rushing him about through numberless anticipated "life-situations" of a bewildering variety. It is the belief of many persons who guard the gates of college that there should be more of the college method in the last two years of school, and a continuation of the school method in the first year of college. That is, without reference to the techniques of junior college curricula, there should be as little wrench as possible; and consequently the eleventh and twelfth grades should be more mature, more searching, more concentrated, than they have been in the past. The English are wiser than we in this respect. Winchester and Oxford are more nearly interchangeable; the College Don and the School Dominie are frequently exchanged. For their viewpoint is the same, and the sixth-former at the public school or the prize-winner in his last year of the County Council Course is as well trained as most sophomores in our

Universities. Any American teacher, even in one single subject of the curriculum, who teaches as the French Abbé of the 18th Century did with his private pupil, or Vittorino da Feltre with the Mantuans or Johnson Cory at Eton, or "old Sawney" at Bell Buckle, is carrying out this ideal; and by their fruits have they become known. These men, if one may draw a parallel from the above-mentioned principles of painting and music and poetry, *did* "build soil" and *were* creative artists of depth and thoroughness.

Let us assume, then, the existence, in every good college or university, of an admissions office and a freshman dean who have a certain amount of discretionary power, an acquaintance with up-to-date school procedures, and a coöperative vision for the programs of entering students. The human material which they accept for a college career will embrace varieties of interest, as the following:

(a) The mechanical constructive type,
(b) The artistic design type,
(c) The musical type,
(d) The editorial and publishing type,
(e) The literary creative type,
(f) The grammatical and linguistic type,
(g) The abstract mathematical type,
(h) The nature and biological type,
(i) The inventor, independent laboratory type,
(j) The business, trade, finance type, and
(k) The manager, diplomat, politician type.

Others will occur to your minds; but these are the most frequent.

Candidates come from schools with programs such as these:

—A—

Tenth Grade:	English	Plane Geometry
	Agriculture	Business Training
	Geography	
Eleventh Grade:	English	Medieval-Modern History
	Sociology	Bookkeeping
	Typing	
Twelfth Grade:	No English!	Commercial Law
	Shorthand	Typing
	Economics	

Pupils from this school have had no foreign language, though in the ninth grade they presumably have been exposed to a year of algebra or "composite mathematics." In such an extreme case, it is probable that most liberal arts colleges will not accept this offering, valuable as it is for those who

know that they are not interested in anything except further vocational training. An occasional brilliant pupil, really able to do college work, might be accepted, with the prospect of considerable repair and replacement effort, and a painful freshman year until the adjustment took place.

—B—

This is the opposite extreme. As the previously mentioned curriculum is well worth while for young people not interested in cultural subjects, so this program, with no biology, fine or practical arts, nothing of a survey variety, while basically good, lacks the flexibility which we all agree today is desirable. The following:

Ninth Grade:	English History (Ancient)	Latin Algebra (½) and Geometry (½)	French
Tenth Grade:	English Greek	German Latin	French Mathematics (equivalent to Algebra A 1 and Plane Geometry to Book IV)
Eleventh Grade:	English French	Greek German	Latin Mathematics (finishing Algebra and Plane Geometry)
Twelfth Grade:	English Greek	German Latin	French Mathematics (Trig. and Solid)
	Physics	Chemistry	History (U. S.)

(Choices widen here—4 or 5 courses from the above, usually 5.)

—C—

A Progressive School, arranged with many choices and containing:

1. A Humanities Core,
2. A Practical Problems Core,
3. An Elective Core.

In this set-up English and history are included under the Humanities, and science, hygiene, handwork, business studies under the Practical Problems. Languages and mathematics are electives, with certain other specialties. An examination of several such types indicates that one language and mathematics may be pursued throughout the high school years.

One might add to these three types—all of them extreme in certain ways —such variations that there might be twenty combinations of patterns, or

even more. Superficially considered, if our college freshman year were still like that of thirty years ago, entrance into higher education of a liberal arts nature would be impossible for seventy-five per cent of our present candidates.

Let us next jump to the college year when "majoring" or concentration begins, and work backwards. This period is different in different institutions; but I will take the sophomore year as perhaps the median when some definite choice must be made. Let us assume some twenty-five or more fields of concentration, an intelligent guidance program in the school and the freshman year, and the concentration flexibility sufficient to allow of change without damage if the student has revised his interests and seen a new light on his future.

Here is a candidate for concentration in mathematics, physics, or astronomy. Any school program which did not recommend mathematics throughout the high school years, with one course in physics, and the two continued during the freshman year, would be a grave injustice to the student. Such a neglect, for a scientist, an astronomer, a statistician or engineer, a geologist, would involve the cost of probably an extra year, or at least the discomfort of being behind-hand in any first class institution of higher learning. The biologist and the chemist would also obviously come under this same head, with an emphasis on science and mathematics. And perhaps this type of pupil has the most comfortable time of all, in the academic sense; he hooks up more closely with home hobbies and summer camp interests. At an early stage he puts especial emphasis on nature-work, drawing of plants and animals, and field expeditions; as he proceeds into the ninth grade, there is a sequence of four sciences—plants, animals, physics, and chemistry—all of which count for college entrance as well as for the school curriculum. They may be combined in a general science sequence intertwined on the progressive basis, or they may be pursued on the old compartmental plan. And in the freshman year his program is involved 50 per cent with his specialty and 50 per cent with general subjects which will keep him from being too narrow.

Let us take the literary and linguistic, the journalistic and magazine type of boy or girl. An examination of the concentration field in English, for example, if one does not wish to be a mere dabbling dilettante, indicates that a major in this department would be handicapped without a ready acquaintance with Latin and one modern language, in addition to extra reading in school, magazine board membership, book-club hobbies, and the like. Such a person should ultimately know the basis of European culture; for him or her a shorter acquaintance with mathematics and less attention to science is proper—just as the mathematician need not have languages crammed down his throat.

Another group out of the eleven or more mentioned above is the young

person whose main desire is government or economics. Here one advises social studies in school to a greater extent than either the scientist or linguist would desire. And the pupil may lean in one direction or the other, with equal benefit.

We might mention thirty of these permutations and combinations—each developed by consecutive guidance and testing. They start with qualities observed in the home; they are groped for in the early stages of school; they coalesce in the secondary period; and they make for comfort and mastery in the college. And what is most important in many people's minds is the building up of a thought and planning sequence, not subject to hunches and temporary likes or dislikes; it is the promotion of a combination or synthesis of the scientific fact-finding method with imaginative and rational encouragement to thought. The "life-situation" thus works inward as well as outward, fundamentally as well as experimentally.

And please note that no high school graduate has become an irrevocable specialist, nor the freshman either. A pattern, cumulative with the growing pupil, can be woven for each. This need not, and should not, be a single design, but should rather run through to the time of graduation from secondary school, reaching a spread fan-wise of four or five of the types named above. And no subject is sacred for its own sake; Latin may be thrown overboard by those who do not need it; mathematics may be reduced to a small compass if the pupil plans other matters. But there should be a thought correlation, and a deep study of whatever courses conduce to the ultimate mastery of a chosen field. The interest of the pupil is maintained at a quality-point, and there is no surrender to the line of least resistance.

The logical consequence of this selective process will mean a comfortable adjustment to the pupil's aptitude which will result in an adequately socialized group, each member having a foretaste but not too uncompromising a commitment to the specialty which most appeals to him. Again, there will be no clashing of vocationalism and culture; for Latin may go hand in hand with shop-work in any child's program; and mathematics may be yoked to fine arts or music or creative poetry.

The next step is clear. It follows from the permutations allowed above, and leads to mastery and power over knowledge. I refer to the trend, increasing now-a-days, towards encouraging advanced studies, or advanced standing, in the last years of school and the freshman year of college. We need not name the score of schools which are doing this work successfully —intensifying, deepening, carrying the pupil further along the road to what I might call "specialization without misrepresentation."

This advanced standing group has successfully proved itself. One third or more of freshman classes in certain colleges are taking one or more courses of a sophomore grade, having in their school course gone beyond the norm

in one or more subjects; they are many of them average pupils and are not confined to the top 20 per cent of the class. They are beginning in the eleventh grade to coördinate school and college, adding to mental maturity a heightened interest in the zest of learning. Dead wood is being cleared out of the way, and the pupil is being prepared as a real expert for concentration in college specialties without any narrowing or burning of bridges. A clear answer to the fears of those who become alarmed at young men developing specialties early is given by William James, who saw the problems of the young both personally and objectively when he wrote from Dresden to Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., in 1868: "I am firmly convinced that by going straight in almost any direction you can get out of the woods in which the young mind grows up; for I have an idea that the process usually consists of a more or less forcible reduction of the other elements of the chaos to a harmony with the terms of the one on which one has taken his particular stand."

These students are being equipped to enter sophomore mathematics; they are mastering the calculus and analytical geometry. The grind ceases; by gradual and comfortable stages the student is prepared not only for the pure theory of speculation but for its applied by-products in probability, insurance, statistics, navigation, strains, and thrusts. Two-year sequences in school science have placed them in more advanced physics, chemistry, biology. Seniors who have completed the usual quota of Latin begin by reading Horace's Odes, some plays of the comedians, and the easier philosophical dialogues of Cicero. They take part in conferences on ancient art and archaeology. French and German are carried on to a degree which enables the student to enter advanced conversational courses in college, and be nearer to the privileges of graduate work in international law, and diplomacy. The pupils are encouraged to do more spade-work on their own account and to progress in the direction of self-education; and perhaps most important of all, the process is not intended for the "grind." These institutions believe that each student whose intelligence rating allows hope for college entrance will find his niche in one or another of the subjects in an enlarged and enriched curriculum.[1]

That this plan is workable has been proved on many occasions and in many schools. Any process of leveling or "socialization" in accordance with the medium level of any community will discourage all progress, both in affairs and in the realm of learning. Tools to initiate new ideas must be ever available. The story of man's striving and progress must be re-written at certain intervals. This continual vitalization, differentiation, word-magic, so to speak, works similarly according to psychology itself; for Professor McFie Campbell declares: "Nature cannot be adequately analyzed

[1] The last two paragraphs are taken, with a few alterations, from an article by the writer in the Harvard *Teachers Review* for January, 1936.

by the method of chemistry and physiology and general biology. One has to do justice to *thought*, that complex symbolizing activity, by means of which the individual grasps the external world and brings it within manageable compass."

The pessimism with which some of the praisers of old days greet the new experiments is unjustified; for there was never a time better than now for the *idea* and the power of the thought process to forge ahead, based as it is upon sensible and favorable discoveries of science and technique.

I realize, in conclusion, that I have been carrying coals to Newcastle in bringing up some of these problems. Many of you are doing all this and more; and some of you are performing valuable experiments and executing a leadership which means volumes in American education. But in thanking you for your hospitality and courtesy to a visitor, I conclude with the feeling that a new light will dawn on our national educational horizon if we stand shoulder to shoulder in promoting a policy of sympathetic attention, of selective discrimination, of wide-spread aid to all who deserve it, and of thoroughness in laying the foundations of solid learning and concentrated mastery. For it is a combination of these qualities that will solve our pressing national problems.

The Functions of Secondary Education*

By Thomas H. Briggs

Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

In its beginnings in America secondary education was frankly imitative. It had no well-defined and comprehensive philosophy or purposes; with no agreement on what it should attempt, it had no plan.

The first national consideration was by the Committee of Ten, appointed by the National Education Association in 1892, composed almost entirely of representatives of colleges and universities. The concept of planning has broadened until we have the Committees on the Orientation of Secondary Education and on the Social-Economic Goals for America and the Educational Policies Commission. These are attempting to plan basically and comprehensively and to promote their findings for popular understanding and wide influence on sound practice.

The history and purposes of the Committee on Orientation and of the Planning Committee and the program of the newly appointed Committee of Implementation of the Department of Secondary School Principals were presented.

The report of the Functions of Secondary Education[1] is an attempt to present the chief intentions and obligations of secondary education. Without an understanding of them the problems of articulation are impossible of solution; as a matter of fact, they are unintelligible. All principals who pretend to professional leadership must not only understand and approve these functions, as stated or as it may seem wise to amend them, but also to use every effort to popularize them with their teachers and with the public, and to achieve them in practice.

To achieve these ends the department is promoting an extensive program attempting to involve all ambitious principals in serious, coöperative, and extended study of the reports on both issues and functions. This program will result in wide acquaintance with these fundamental matters and will undoubtedly lead to support of the Committee on Implementation, which will attempt to propose the most important implications for practical procedures.

This is a democratic program. It can succeed only if the leaders in the profession, the principals of secondary schools, from the smallest to the largest, assiduously persist in the preliminary study necessary to appreciation of the basic importance of the issues and functions, if they then demand

* Abstract of an address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1938.

[1] Bulletin 64 of the Department of Secondary School Principals, 5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago.

continued expert assistance in developing the practical program, if they subsequently coöperate in the indicated experimentation, and if they finally bend every effort and exercise all their skill in leadership to use in their schools the procedures that are proved sound and essential.

This is a challenge to men and women in secondary education. The extent to which they coöperate and persist in the project is a measure of their professionalization.

NOTE

The following addresses before the Southern Association meeting in Dallas, March 28-April 1, which were to have been published in this issue of the SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY proved not to be available:

1. The brief inspirational address of Rev. Matthew Arnold before the dinner meeting of the Association;
2. The address, "The Function of Higher Education in America," by President T. O. Walton of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College before the Association April 1;
3. The address, "Evaluation of the Educational Program of the Secondary School," by Dr. Ralph W. Tyler, Research Director, Evaluation in the Eight-year Study of the Thirty Schools, Ohio State University, before the Commission on Secondary Schools March 30.

—*Editor.*